

**Butts**

**A Backstory**



**Heather Radke**



# BUTTS

---

A Backstory

---

Heather Radke

**AVID READER PRESS**

New York • London • Toronto • Sydney • New Delhi

*For my mother*

## *Introduction*

The first butt I remember isn't my own. It's my mother's. At seven years old, I would sit on the fluffy toilet seat cover in my parents' bathroom and watch her get ready for the day, standing in front of the mirror in her bra and underwear, smearing lotion onto her body. She rolled Velcro curlers into her short brown hair: a few girthy pink ones on top, several smaller green ones on the sides. She cracked the window to let out the steam of the shower, and the Michigan morning air—cold and thin—woke me up. *Close your eyes*, she told me, and as I did, she'd liberally douse her hair with hairspray. I held my breath, fearing the sticky choke. Then, she took her glasses off and leaned in close to the mirror and curled her lashes, her butt sticking out as she leaned over the counter.

As a young girl, my mom's was the only naked adult body I had ever seen. I imagined all women's bodies looked like hers: shapely and short, with full breasts and an ample butt that filled out any pair of pants. I liked the idea that one day my body would look the same—a fate that seemed as inevitable as growing taller or getting my period. She was beautiful and free as she went about her morning ablutions.

The clear-sightedness of childhood allowed me to see my mother's butt for what it actually was—a body part like any other, something to love because I loved the human it was part of. It was not a problem or a blessing. It was only a fact.

What I did not know then is that butts are not so simple. They are not like elbows or knees, functional body parts that carry few associations beyond their physiological function. Instead, butts, silly as they may often seem, are tremendously complex symbols, fraught with significance and nuance, laden

with humor and sex, shame and history. Women's butts have been used as a means to create and reinforce racial hierarchies, as a barometer for the virtues of hard work, and as a measure of sexual desire and availability. Despite (or perhaps because of) the fact that there is little a person can do to dramatically change the way their butt looks without surgical intervention, the shape and size of a woman's butt has long been a perceived indicator of her very nature—her morality, her femininity, and even her humanity.

But butts can be hard to see clearly. The fact that they are on our backside means they are somewhat alien to us, even as they are perfectly visible to others. To see your butt, you need the cocoon of mirrors of a dressing room, the cumbersome triangulation of a hand mirror in a bedroom, or an awkwardly held smartphone. And when you catch sight of your butt—or at least when I catch sight of my butt—there is always a bit of surprise: *That is what is trailing me?* There is a note of humiliation in this—we don't ever really know what someone else is seeing when they look at our butts, which makes us vulnerable. There is also a giving-over: in some ways, the butt belongs to the viewer more than the viewed. It can be observed secretly, ogled in private, creepily scrutinized. In order to know how a pair of pants fits, I must ask a salesperson how my butt looks because I cannot see for myself. A woman passes a man on the street and then his head turns to look at her butt. Although everyone else on the street may spot the greedy glance, the woman may not, and doesn't realize she is being assessed, criticized, objectified, desired.

Even the words for our backside resist clarity. The terms we use are always euphemisms, never sure things. I grew up referring to the two masses of flesh attached to the back of my hips as a butt. It is the word a kid uses, the word your obnoxious brother hurls at you. Butthead! Buttface! A hilarious idea—having a butt for a face—but it's not an insult that has much impact beyond the age of ten. The word *butt* is funny, but the humor is mild, familiar, and innocuous. A man slips and falls smack-dab on his butt; chuckles ensue. If the word *butt* were a noise, it would be the honk of a clown horn, or maybe a fart.

As I got older I experimented with other words. *Ass* felt a bit more grown-up, a bit more obscene—a word in the category we used to call “swears.” But it's a light swear, the least of the offenders. You can say *ass* on TV, although you can't

say *asshole*. There are many other terms for the body part in question: In the UK they call it a bum; in Yiddish they call it a tuchus. Sometimes people get a little highbrow and a little French and call it a *derrière*. These days, grocery store tabloids and TV talk shows usually call it a booty or a badonkadonk, words lifted from hip-hop songs and country music, used to connote sexiness, silliness, and race. There is also a whole category of words that refer to the physical positioning of the part on the body: *behind*, *backside*, *posterior*, *rear end*, *bottom*.

But what is the *proper* word? The fundamental word? What is our neutral term that signifies “the fatty, fleshy part of your body that you sit on”? Although there are boobs and tits and jugs, ultimately we know the correct, “official” word is *breasts*. We might call a man’s sexual organ a dick or schlong, but we know there is a “right” word, and that word is *penis*. *Buttocks* seems to be the obvious choice, but it’s a word rarely used in real life. You wouldn’t say, “My buttocks are sore,” after a tough workout, nor would you say, “My buttocks don’t look good in these pants.” I once asked a surgeon friend how his fellow doctors refer to it, thinking that I might find the most practical word in the medical lexicon. He told me the colorectal surgeons—the ones who likely spend the most time talking about it—use words like *rear* and *bottom*. One surgeon he knows employs the very scientific *gluteal cleft* when he means *crack*; another invariably calls the body part in question a tush. Even in the doctor’s office, there are layers of euphemism. The muscle has a scientific name—*gluteus maximus*—but that term refers only to the sinewy bundle of fibers that stretches from the pelvic bone to the thigh. The fatty layer on top is called the gluteofemoral fat mass. No one calls it that.

Because of this triangulated, euphemistic relationship we often have with our butts (the word I’ve settled on as the most straightforward), our ideas about them often tell us more about the viewer than the viewed, the meaning determined by who is looking and when they are looking and why. As historian Sander Gilman puts it, “The buttocks have ever-changing symbolic value. They are associated with the organs of reproduction, the aperture of excretion, as well as with the mechanism of locomotion through the discussions of gait. They never represent themselves.”

This idea—that the butt never represents itself—makes it a peculiar and peculiarly compelling object of study. Because the butt is capricious in what it symbolizes, sifting through and investigating the profusion of meanings and signification can tell us a tremendous amount about many other things: what people perceive to be normal, what they perceive to be desirable, what they perceive to be repellant, and what they perceive to be transgressive. Butts are a bellwether. The feelings we have about butts are almost always indicative of other feelings—feelings about race, gender, and sex, feelings that differ profoundly from one person to the next.

---

Everyone has a different origin story for how they feel about their adult body. Like photographs pasted into a scrapbook, the way I feel about mine emerges from fractured memories of times when I felt my body being seen by others. But my earliest memories of my body come from just before puberty, when my limbs and muscles seemed useful and resilient, rather than like parts to be assessed. I rode my bike all over the neighborhood, sped down hills, and felt the humid summer wind fly through my nostrils. On one July afternoon, I tumbled face-first over the handlebars and scraped up my cheeks and forehead on the cement, breaking open the flap of skin that connected my lip to my gums. Blood poured all over the sidewalk and then the kitchen, where I sat on the counter with my feet dangling as my mother held ice to my mouth. The next morning, I was eating Cheerios in a purple polyester ballerina outfit, ready to ride again. My father took pictures of me at the kitchen table, smiling and cheerful. I wasn't particularly fearless, but I understood my body as a thing that would grow, would heal, would take me places. By the time the roll of film was developed, I only had a few scabs left.

When I was eight, I went with a friend to her parents' gym to swim in the pool, and I found myself for the first time in a locker room full of women in various states of undress. There were so many kinds of bodies, and since I had not yet learned to put bodies in categories, to rank and order them as good and bad, all I could do was observe. *Breasts can look like that?* I thought, catching

glimpses of parts that didn't look like my mother's. *Hips can be straight? Butts can be bony?* The women in the locker room seemed misshapen. Dressed, they'd looked familiar, but underneath their clothes, they had been hiding all kinds of oddities, shaped in so many different ways.

At ten, I was riding my bike with a friend, around the same blocks we'd been circling for years, when two boys shouted at us from behind a bush. "*Nice butts!*" we heard them say. The comment had the bite of cruelty, but there was something else in it, a new and dangerous feeling, one I now know to be the particular anxiety of having your body seen and commented upon by a male stranger.

The fact that they said something unprompted about our butts felt uncomfortable and bizarre. Butts were not a body part I thought could be *nice*. I was aware that there were body parts that were considered beautiful and sexy and were coveted by others, but it had not occurred to me that the butt was one of them. It felt like they'd caught us with our pants down—as though they'd seen our *actual* butts due to some hilarious and humiliating mistake. We rode back to my house and told my parents what had happened. Somehow, they managed to track down the two boys—young teenagers with skateboards and heavy metal T-shirts—and confronted them about their catcalling. The boys nervously swore that they had shouted, "*Nice bikes.*" I remember feeling embarrassed all over again. Of course butts were not a thing that could be *nice*. Certainly not a thing someone would shout about down the street.

By middle school, I was the oddity in the locker room. I wasn't *fat*, exactly—the adjective that carried the most profound stigma in the dusty halls of Kinawa Middle School—but my body definitely didn't feel like it looked right. It was slowly turning into a youthful approximation of my mother's: my butt had grown, my hips had widened. Standing in front of the burnt-orange lockers, I no longer found myself in awe of the diversity of the female body; it was plain to me that there was a correct way to look, and the way I looked, and the way my mom looked, certainly wasn't it.

Around the same time, the PE department separated the girls and boys to teach us how to swim in the school's hyper-chlorinated, crumbling pool. In an unusual gesture designed, I suppose, to level any class distinctions, the school



provided us with black swimming suits made of cotton with very little stretch. We plucked them out of gray plastic bins, organized by size, each suit well worn by industrial laundry machines and by generations of anxious girls shivering within them at the edge of the pool. The sizes of the suits were indicated by the stitching: suits with yellow stitching were the smallest, the size for girls who still had the bodies of children. Orange was the most coveted color—the suit of a girl who had matured but had no roundness. Red stitching meant large, and white meant larger still—the colors for girls who had breasts and butts and thighs and bellies. Girls who had *substance*. The black fabric that covered us from armpit to midthigh expanded and grew loose when wet. My suit had red stitching, and I dreaded the looming specter of the white thread. I worried what it would mean about my body, my attractiveness, my place in the order of things.

In high school, I was confronted with even more concrete evidence that my body was somehow wrong. Although I could barely run a mile, I would occasionally fraternize with the tenth-grade cross-country team, attending their pregame spaghetti dinners, where we would heap gluey pasta with jarred red sauce on our plates and gossip about school. At one of these dinners, a friend pulled me aside to tell me a secret—the kind of secret no one should tell. She revealed that a girl on the team had been overheard at practice complaining about how fat she was getting. How her hips were *so* big. Another girl laughed at this and said, *At least your butt isn't as big as Heather's*.

I was shaken. I imagined the willowy and desirable blondes of the cross-country team, laughing heartily and venomously about one thing they all knew to be true: Heather Radke did, indeed, have a big butt. And they were oh so glad they did not.

---

The story of my relationship with my body isn't a dramatic one. In fact, I'm interested in it primarily because it strikes me as fairly typical. There was no relentless bullying, no significant eating disorder, nothing that pushes my feelings about my body beyond the shame that seems to infect the brain of every seventh-grade girl, a hellish rite of passage so many of us had to get through to

become semi-functioning adults. It's as though the ranking of bodies—and all the attendant humiliation and self-doubt—is normal, natural even. As though there actually *are* bodies that are better, and those that are worse.

The first time someone told me my butt was sexy was in 2003. I was twenty and it was summertime and I was pulling shots of espresso behind a coffee bar in a Midwestern college town. I was wearing a polyester, navy blue pleated skirt and a thrifted yellow T-shirt that I had cut the neck out of, in an attempt to make it look more punk. My hair was pulled back; grounds of coffee stuck to my sweaty neck. Since high school, my butt had grown ever larger. Every pair of pants seemed to fit me strangely, gaping at the waist even as they stretched tightly across my butt—I went from wearing a size eight to wearing a size ten, then twelve and fourteen. If a group needed to squeeze four into the back of a car, I would blurt out that my ass was actually too large to make it work and that someone should just sit on my lap. One day, my coworker at the coffeehouse—a quiet singer-songwriter boy who was tall and flirty—asked me, “Do you know what *callipygian* means?” I did. I’d learned it for the SATs and could still recall the flash card that made me blush. The word is Greek. It means “having beautiful buttocks.” I supposed that art historians must have used it in describing statuary. “You, darling, are callipygian,” the singer-songwriter told me. His delivery was definitely awkward and the line felt rehearsed, like he was testing out vocabulary that was just beyond his reach. Even so, I was frankly moved. He wasn’t making fun of me. It felt like a sincere compliment.

He was only the first in a series of people I encountered in my twenties and thirties who seemed to regard my generous butt not as a drawback, but as a virtue. It became the frequent subject of catcalls; the word on a lover’s lips as they whispered in my ear; the part of my body that elicited second glances from strangers and comments from men at work. In other words, I was becoming aware that my butt was—or had become, when I wasn’t looking—a sexual object, a thing that other people (*some* other people; certainly not *all* other people) found desirable.

And those people were almost always men. Although I am queer, and although I dated both men and women during those years, the truth was that this change in how other people thought about my butt seemed to be emanating

from straight, mainstream culture. Plenty of women commented on my butt, but they were mostly straight and seemed to be parroting beauty magazines in an updated, inverted version of the girl on the cross-country team who said she was so glad her butt was not like mine.

Although I told myself that what other people—especially men—thought about my body shouldn't matter, the truth was it really did. All of a sudden, a part of me that had felt shameful and ugly was the part that some people liked most. Although I didn't want to be admired only for my body, I certainly wanted my body to be admired. Like all people, I wanted to be wanted. And it felt good to be wanted by the sort of people who had once made me feel ashamed.

I wonder now how my peers in high school came to their initial conclusion that my body wasn't one of the *good* ones, and how, a decade later, many of those same men and women came to feel the opposite. How could it be that what a butt means had seemed to change so radically, and so quickly? How could a body part mean so many different things to so many different people? Those are the questions that prompted the research at the heart of this book.

---

Before becoming a writer, I worked for a number of years as a curator at the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum in Chicago, a historic-house museum that also functioned as a contemporary art space and community gathering place for the city's activists. When I put together an exhibition at Hull-House, my job was to present stories and cultural experiences that helped to explain larger shifts and themes in history. This book is meant to work in a similar way: I will introduce you to figures from the past and present and tell specific stories that speak to important shifts in what butts have represented in the United States and Western Europe over the past two centuries.

*Butts: A Backstory* is an attempt to trace some of the threads of thought and meaning surrounding this enigmatic body part, and explore how they evolved and continue to resonate in the present. The approach is largely historical and chronological but begins with the scientific basics: What, exactly, *is* a butt

anatomically and physiologically? Though butts have been around forever, my framework's historical starting point is the story of Sarah Baartman, once called the "Venus Hottentot," whose cruel and lurid display in life and death is foundational to perceptions of the butt for the past two centuries. From there, I explore a number of topics extending through the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, peering into the histories of fashion, race, science, fitness, and popular culture, encountering a procession of people who have shaped ideas about butts—an illustrator who defined the sleek look of the flapper, a model whose butt is used as the template for nearly every pair of pants on the market, a eugenicist artist who created sculptures of the most "normal" man and woman, the man who invented Buns of Steel, drag queens who design butt pads, and fat fitness instructors who used aerobics as a form of resistance and a way to find joy. Finally, I explore changing attitudes toward the butt in the last thirty years—a time when large butts gradually became integrated into the mainstream, white beauty ideal and the appropriation of Black bodies and culture hit a new peak.

---

A project like this could never be all things to all people. It can't begin to answer the question, *What is the history and meaning of every butt?* In this book, I focus on the history and symbolism of women's butts for the simple reason that I am a woman and I began this project because I was interested in how feminine identity is constructed, reconstructed, and reinforced over time.

My research also deals exclusively with the *butt*—the two protruding masses of muscle and fat situated between the lower back and thighs. There are a number of excellent books exploring the anus and rectum and their myriad associations and functions, but those are not my objects of study. Although there are relationships between the symbolic meanings of the anus and the butt, women's butts frequently carry their own, separate symbolism and aren't necessarily linked to the various functions of the anus, sexual or otherwise.

I am primarily interested in butts as construed and represented by mainstream, hegemonic, Western culture—the culture of those who hold political and economic power, those who dominate popular media and who are



most responsible for creating, perpetuating, and enforcing broad standards and trends. That is, I am often exploring how straight people, white people, and men have (mis)understood and enforced standards, preferences, and ideology on the butts of women of all races, and the meanings they have constructed about women's bodies in the process. Of course, these are general categories and may suggest binaries where they do not exist—the experience of living inside a body always constitutes multiple, intersecting identities—but it has often been people who identify as male, straight, and/or white who have been able to determine the meanings of butts because they were in positions of power.

I've decided to focus on these mainstream concepts of women's butts because I wish to understand where the often unspoken ideas and prejudices about butts come from, and to speak that history clearly. Because of the power they've long held in science, politics, media, and culture, white people, men, and straight people have always maintained an inordinate amount of influence and control over what meanings are applied to bodies. They have invented and enforced ideas of what is normal and what is deviant, what is “mainstream” and what is marginal. By looking closely at how people in power have constructed those meanings, my hope is that I will make visible something that often feels invisible: the deep historical roots of why women seem to have so many—and so many contradictory—feelings about their butts. I wanted to understand why butts have come to mean so much, when they could very well mean nothing at all.

One thing I found consistently throughout my research is that conversations about butts are almost always also conversations about race, specifically about Blackness and whiteness. From the earliest days of colonial exploration in Africa, European explorers and scientists employed pseudoscientific theories about big-butt Black women to construct and reinforce racial hierarchies and stereotypes (particularly the doggedly persistent stereotype of the hypersexual Black woman), a set of ideas that were amplified and reinforced in the wake of Sarah Baartman's death in the nineteenth century. Both Black femininity and white femininity are ideas that are informed by stereo types of the body and the butt created by scientists in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, stereotypes that affect not only Black women and white women but women of all races. It is

for this reason that this book is so often an exploration of Blackness and whiteness specifically.

Of course, any knowledge I have of what butts mean and have meant within communities of color, in other nations, and in cultures of the past is derived from reporting and research, not firsthand experience. My experience with my body is specific, and the shame I have felt about my butt comes from the particular context I grew up in. It is not at all universal. Many of those I've spoken with in my research for this book love their butts or grew up with very different ideas about what constitutes an ideal body than I did. In these pages, I've endeavored to include voices of those who can speak to experiences other than my own, and I've conducted interviews with women and nonbinary people from disparate backgrounds as crucial foundational research. Ultimately, though, this book is an idiosyncratic one. It stems from the questions that most interest me about the butt: questions about gender, race, control, fitness, fashion, and science. It is not an encyclopedia of butts and does not attempt or claim to be comprehensive—it is not the final word on the subject, and there are many fascinating areas of research associated with butts that are not included in these pages. My hope is that by not only exploring historical context but also articulating my personal experiences and feelings, I can contend with my own body straightforwardly and help others to see that that which we do not name, that which goes unsaid, holds tremendous power. In that sense, this book is a political project as much as anything else: it is a way of teasing out and examining levers of power that aren't always visible.

---

“I personally do not find my butt sexy. I am self-conscious about its largeness,” a white woman in her midthirties told me. “It’s horrifying to imagine that there’s someone in my life that knows what it looks like really well. But many strange men have made it clear they find my butt sexy. Since I was young, I have always known that men of all walks of life like my butt. Not all of them; skinny white guys don’t like my butt very much.”

“I’d probably think my butt was fabulous if I was white,” says a small-butted Black woman in her fifties. “But like many things about me, it’s one of the things that makes me sort of racially inauthentic. Whenever I say this, people get tense; they think I’m hating on myself. I just mean that I was plagued as a child by other people’s assessment that I was not Black enough.”

Another white woman in her thirties describes her ideal body for herself as “as androgynous as possible but still female—small breasts, no hips. Classic androgynous dyke. Jenny Shimizu.” But she’s attracted to big-butted women. “My first girlfriend had a big butt and I couldn’t get over it. It looks good, it feels good, and it’s nice to hold on to. It’s the opposite of the body I have.” Lately she’s been wondering if her idealized body for herself is a problem. “I’ve started to wonder how much of this ideal is internalized misogyny. Why does it feel like a feminine body cannot house brilliance and sarcasm? Why am I hewing so closely to these sexist narratives?”

A Chinese American woman in her twenties describes her butt as “a good protrusion” on her “planklike shape.” But she also tells me, “I’m continuously surprised when my butt is sexualized. I guess I have a fear that my sex appeal is rooted in having this girl-like figure. I wonder if my sexiness is some offshoot of pedophilia, [if] any interest in me is the sexualization of a schoolgirl.” It’s not something she’s ever brought up with a partner, but it is always in the back of her mind.

Over and over again in my research, I’ve been surprised by how many different meanings one body part can contain. And yet, several of the women I talked to told similar stories about how they came to understand their bodies. For some, their mothers and grandmothers and aunts told them to cover themselves up. For others, those same relations taught them how to enjoy their curves. Catcalls and middle-school taunts told them where they stood in the order of things. Nearly every woman, regardless of the size and shape of her butt, told a story about a dressing room and the sinking feeling that there would never be a pair of pants that fit her correctly.

In so many ways, butts ask us to turn away, to giggle with hot-faced shame and roll our eyes. When I started writing this book, I wondered what would happen if I instead turned my full attention toward the butt, if I investigated its

history and asked butt experts and enthusiasts of all stripes—scientists, drag queens, dance instructors, historians, and archivists—serious questions about what butts are and what butts mean. In doing so, I found stories of tragedy, anger, oppression, lust, and joy. And I found that in our bodies, we carry histories.



---

# Origins

---

# MUSCLE



If you happened to find yourself near the arid shores of Kenya's Lake Turkana 1.9 million years ago, you might have encountered the first known hominid with a butt. This creature was closer to a modern human than an ape: His nose was distinct from his face, a cartilaginous appendage rather than two holes in his head. His face was flat, with eyes that looked forward. He had a bony brow ridge with a forehead that sloped steeply back. He walked, and ran, on two legs. And he had a protruding gluteal muscle at the top of each hip, the underlying flesh of a round, strong backside.

The area he lived in would have looked much like the African savanna as we know it now, with few trees and open grassland, a relatively recent change from the lush, dense, jungle-like forest his distant relatives had inhabited for millions of years. The ancestors of *Homo erectus* had bodies adapted to life in the trees: agile, flexible legs and feet designed for climbing, as well as apelike snouts, hairy bodies, and enormous jaws that allowed them to grind down massive amounts of vegetation. Their butts were flat and small—hardly butts at all. By the time this specific *Homo erectus* came on the scene, however, the bodies of hominids had adapted to their new, flat terrain. To succeed on the savanna, large gluteal muscles were a must.

Several millennia later, in the summer of 1974, Bernard Ngeneo slowly paced the same eastern shore of Lake Turkana, peering intently at the dark, sandy soil. He was there as a member of what he and his colleagues affectionately referred to as the “Hominid Gang,” a group of Kenyans working on the expeditions of Richard Leakey, a famous and often controversial paleontologist and conservationist. The members of the Hominid Gang were known for their

expert ability to find human fossils buried deep in rock or hidden in plain sight among bones and shells—just two years earlier, Ngeneo had discovered a skull buried beneath a pile of animal fossils that was believed to be evidence of an entirely new species in the *Homo* family.

Ngeneo trained his keen eye on a rock cemented with pebbles and shells, remnants from the bottom of an ancient lake that had been covered by sediment for millions of years. There, among the solid remains of aquatic life, Ngeneo glimpsed something promising poking up out of the rock. A closer look revealed that the expert hominid finder had struck again. Ngeneo had found fossil KNM-ER 3228, a right hip bone and the last remaining part of a male hominid who had walked the shores of Lake Turkana 1.9 million years before, the oldest hip bone anyone had ever found (or has found since). And although there is no documentation suggesting that anyone thought much about this specific bone on the dig—it was one of many hominid parts found that summer—Ngeneo's discovery would give science a critical tool for understanding the purpose, and evolutionary backstory, of the human butt.

---

It was Dr. Daniel Lieberman, Edwin M. Lerner II Professor of Biological Sciences and chair of the Department of Human Evolutionary Biology at Harvard, who directed me to fossil KNM-ER 3228. Although scientists in the nineteenth century created a robust pseudoscience of the butt as part of a larger project of creating and justifying racial hierarchies, the butt wasn't a particularly rich topic of study for much of the twentieth century. For the past twenty years, however, Lieberman has been the go-to guy for the biology of the butt, and he's likely the scientist who has taken the most keen interest in fossil KNM-ER 3228.

When Lieberman encountered the fossil in the 1990s, he found a key to answering a question that few evolutionary biologists had ever taken seriously, and one that became Lieberman's singular point of focus for many years. It wasn't, however, a question about butts—or at least it didn't start as one. Instead, it was a question about running.

While in graduate school at Harvard, Lieberman had been taught that humans were terrible runners and that running was a relatively unimportant adaptation in the history of human evolution. Biologists understood human running as little more than fast walking, a byproduct of bipedalism that humans weren't particularly well suited for. Instead, they believed that the champion runners of the animal kingdom were sleek quadrupeds like antelopes and cheetahs, whose four legs allowed them to gallop and spring forth with all four feet off the ground, and gave them stealth and maneuverability. Because it's impossible to gallop with two legs, four-legged animals will always have an advantage over even the fastest humans. (For example, Usain Bolt can sprint at ten meters per second for several seconds, but an antelope or a horse can sprint at fifteen meters per second for several minutes.) Humans are good at a lot of things, evolutionary biologists thought, but running isn't one of them. During the course of his studies, however, Lieberman began to believe that the conventional wisdom might be wrong.

He came to this conclusion while conducting an experiment where he observed miniature pigs trotting on treadmills. One day, as Lieberman was conducting his pig exercise research, a colleague named Dennis Bramble stopped by to observe. Bramble pointed out that the pigs' heads flopped around when they ran, probably because they didn't have a special ligament (called the nuchal ligament) in the back of their skull to help steady their heads while in motion. All the great runners of the animal kingdom have this ligament—horses, dogs, cheetahs, jackrabbits. Animals that aren't great runners, including apes and chimpanzees, do not. But as Lieberman and Bramble talked, they remembered that one animal who was supposedly a terrible runner *did* have the ligament: humans.

Bramble and Lieberman were intrigued. They'd both read a paper—at that point dismissed by many biologists—that posited that running was actually a crucial part of human evolution, rather than a mere side effect of bipedalism. As they thought more about the nuchal ligament, they started to wonder if there might be something to it.

In order to figure it out, Bramble and Lieberman went to the Harvard Museum and started digging through fossils so they could figure out when the



nuchal ligament became part of the story of human evolution and why. They quickly discovered that it appeared in the fossil record at a very important moment in human evolution—about two million years ago, when *Homo erectus* first came on the scene. *Homo erectus* was the first human ancestor to walk around on two legs, and also—critically—the first ancestor to have a large brain.

As they examined the fossil record, Lieberman and Bramble discovered that nearly all of the physical traits that make it possible for humans to run appeared around the same time our ancestors became bipedal. This fact suggested to them that hominids may have become bipedal, in part, in order to run. *Homo erectus* was the first hominid species to have short toes that could bend and flex when it launched itself forward; the first species to have arched inner feet and long Achilles tendons, which act like springs and shock absorbers; the first species to have hips that can twist and knees that can bear the load of the hard footfalls of a running creature. It was also the first species to have a butt.

This discovery led Lieberman to the extensive study of the butt in human running. He closely examined the anatomical differences between the butts of humans and those of their closest primate relatives and attached electrodes to the butts of human research subjects as they ran on treadmills in an effort to determine what, exactly, the gluteus maximus does when a person breaks into a jog. By 2013 he had become famous for his research and made an appearance on *The Colbert Report* to describe the butt's evolutionary purpose. "If you look at the butt of a chimpanzee, it's tiny. They have really, really pathetic butts," he explained. Humans, on the other hand, have enormous butts; our gluteus maximus is the biggest muscle in our body and we are still the only animals on Earth that have such a large gluteal muscle. Like the whites of our eyes and the arches in our feet, the gluteus maximus is a uniquely human feature. He encouraged Colbert to walk around with his palms firmly affixed to his butt cheeks so that he might feel how flaccid the muscles are when walking. Then Lieberman asked Colbert to run. "Do you feel it clenching up?"

When I spoke to Lieberman, he suggested that I perform the same test, though in my case I had to dig in deep to feel the muscles move because my butt isn't just, or even mostly, muscle. As I ran around in a circle in my apartment, my toes sprung me forward, my hips twisted, my butt clenched. Despite the fact

that I can barely make it twice around the block at a slow jog, Lieberman assured me that my body was designed for the task, and that proof of this could be found in the Arizona desert.

---

Every October since 1983, in the thin air of Prescott, Arizona, a soulful blinds salesman named Ron Barrett has organized a race straightforwardly called Man Against Horse. According to Barrett, the race began as a bar bet between a local city councilman and a horse-loving police officer. The drunken city councilman asserted that a well-trained human could beat a horse in a foot race. The policeman disagreed and, feeling certain of his odds, suggested they put money on it. The two men set up a course, and for the next four decades, a version of that race has been an annual tradition. The concept is simple: a group of humans and horses traverses the desert in a daylong endurance race that pits beast against beast, human against human, and, most crucially, one against the other.

These days, humans and horses go head-to-head on Mingus Mountain, a 7,800-foot pine-covered peak thirty miles outside of Prescott. Although Barrett sets up 12- and 25-mile races, the real race—the one that attracts some of the world’s best distance runners and endurance riders—is the 50-mile ultrarun.

Skeptical but curious, I traveled to the course to see what Lieberman described as a primordial battle unfold. Horses would hurl their 1,500-pound bodies (more with their rider) up a small rocky path, balanced atop four hooves, each smaller than a human hand. After completing the length of a full marathon along the same route, the runners would climb 1,700 feet up the back of the steep mountain, ascending “knee to cheek,” as Ron Barrett describes it. Even then, they would only be halfway done—they would then need to run almost twenty more miles before they crossed the finish line. And then, after a day of primal competition, all the humans would gorge on barbecue.

When I arrived, I discovered that the event begins on a flat, arid expanse where runners and riders both set up camp the day before. One side of a small creek was the land of horses. Each animal arrived in an enormous trailer along

with all that was needed to care for them: hay and hoof-picks and saddles and special shoes that looked like Crocs designed to protect the horses' small hooves from the rugged terrain. The riders set up makeshift paddocks, small fenced-in areas for the horses to rest and eat in. As they did, the animals huffed and whinnied, snorted and nickered, cutting a bold silhouette against the bright blue desert sky.

On the other side of the creek was the land of runners. They pulled up in energy-efficient Subarus, ate vegan gel that came in pouches, wore clothes that could be bunched up into a sack the size of a fist. "Tiny heinies" was what one of the endurance riders called the runners, and the runners almost all fit the description: small, lithe, and thin, with lean, muscular butts—butts built to beat the enormous and powerful beasts munching grass across the creek.

Despite the seemingly long odds, in every version of the Man Against Horse Race, at least one runner had beaten at least one horse. Lieberman himself had done it—the year he ran, he remembered, he bested "almost all the horses"—and he was "just a middle-aged professor!" But there had never been a human runner who had beaten all the horses. The year I attended, however, buzz floated through the camp about one runner in particular: Nick Coury, a software engineer from Phoenix, who happened to be one of the world's best ultramarathoners and was thought to just maybe possess the goods to win the ultimate human victory.

I met Nick on the morning of the race as he sat in the trunk of his hatchback, rubbing his eyes and yawning. After inhaling an entire sausage pizza on the late-night drive up from Phoenix, he had slept in his car. I asked him if he thought he might be able to beat the horses. He smiled and said humbly, "I don't like to get ahead of myself," before pulling on his shorts, lacing up his shoes, and darting over to the porta-potties. Even in the ultrarunning world, where fifty-mile runs are commonplace, this one was hard: Nick would have to climb 2,800 feet up a labyrinthine trail, confronting loose rocks and tough footing and significant temperature changes—not to mention the enormous, heaving equines running alongside him.

The run started at six a.m. The air was dry—I'd spend the entire day smearing my face with Vaseline in a Sisyphean effort to mitigate the effects of the high

desert air—and the early morning sky was clear and pink. I had imagined a whinnying pack of horses pawing at the ground, bunched up with a group of focused runners at a ceremonial starting block, but both horses and runners preferred a less cinematic, calmer beginning. The runners stretched and jogged in place. Horses pranced around in a large, loose circle. The starting line wasn't much more than a small flag and a mark in the dirt. Ron didn't even shoot a starter pistol, because it might have scared the horses. He just yelled, rather inefficiently, "Man Against Horse Race starts right now! Here we go!" And then they were off.

The horses galloped out of the gate, but once they reached the foot of the mountain, they began to move slowly and carefully to avoid a fall. Nick and the other humans started at a slow jog and quickly found themselves literally eating their competition's dust. But although the horses had speed, humans had a different advantage: they had endurance. And this, according to Lieberman, is vital to the story of human evolution.

The human ability to run long distances, as Lieberman explains it, evolved when *Homo erectus* went from living in forests to roaming the grasslands, a lifestyle that demanded different capacities and capabilities. When animals live among trees, as gorillas still do today, there is plenty to eat: bugs, berries, and vegetation are all abundant. These foods are fibrous and hard to chew, but a gorilla's low metabolism makes it possible for them to live off of it. They can spend all day eating without having to worry about running out of nourishment.

*Homo erectus*, on the other hand, needed to figure out a way to sustain themselves without the inexhaustible gifts of the woodlands. Instead of eating bucketloads of berries and leaves, they turned to what was available: the flesh of animals, which, unlike the low-quality foods of the forest, offered significant quantities of calories and protein per bite. Nutrient-rich wilde beests and kudu dotted the savanna, but how could the relatively slow-moving *Homo erectus* keep up with, and hunt down, these speedy, four-legged beasts?

For more than a century, evolutionary biologists, including Darwin, surmised that *Homo erectus*'s ability to hunt fast-moving savanna creatures was due to one of the major advantages of bipedalism: *Homo erectus*'s hands had been freed up



to make, and use, tools for hunting like spears, bows, and arrows. But recent archaeology has shown this to be unlikely. It is harder than you might think to penetrate a tough, leathery animal hide, and harder still to inflict the damage necessary to fell a racing, six-hundred-pound wildebeest. You'd need to use a stone-tipped spear or arrow to get the job done, but the best tools *Homo erectus* had available were wooden clubs and sharpened sticks. They would have had to be in very close proximity to an animal in order to kill it. So what did early humans do without sophisticated weapons? They used their butts.

According to Lieberman, the reason why Nick Coury would have any chance at all in the Man Against Horse Race is because early humans evolved a specific advantage over many quadrupeds: although a four-legged animal can run very fast, it can't run at high speeds for long stretches of time. Horses and other quadrupeds are incapable of panting when they gallop—they can only pant while trotting or walking. This means they can't keep themselves cool while running at high speeds. In intense heat, after ten to fifteen kilometers of galloping, they have to slow down to modulate their temperature. This is true as well of the animals that ancient humans hunted on the savanna, an environment much hotter and flatter than Mingus Mountain. An antelope running at full speed in high heat can't keep up the pace for long. Humans, on the other hand, can run at a slower pace for hours at a time, and a running human moves just a little bit faster than most trotting quadrupeds. This is possible thanks, in part, to the unique collection of dense muscle at the top of our legs.

The human butt muscles are part of a complicated stabilizing apparatus: the gluteus maximus equivalent in chimps is primarily a muscle that allows them to move their legs away from the body, but in humans it is an extensor—a muscle that allows an animal to straighten and extend a limb outward. It is a critical part of the system that keeps us from tumbling forward as we launch ourselves off our back feet when we run, and it helps to slow us down just a bit as our foot hits the ground so that we maintain control over our stride. The butt is an essential adaptation for the human ability to run steadily, for long distances, and without injury.

As evolution slowly crawled along, *Homo erectus*'s brain got bigger. It takes a lot of calories to maintain brain tissue; a breastfeeding mother would have

required about 2,500 calories every day. This was a hard goal to meet on the savanna, and so hunting and running were necessary to continue feeding the evolving organs that would eventually allow hominids to use tools, create agriculture, read books, and make outlandish bets at bars. Lieberman believes that the butt, among other adaptations, allowed *Homo erectus* to chase after prey for miles until they tired and had to stop. Then *Homo erectus* would bash their prey over the head with a rock and eat the spoils, making it possible for them to eat a large, calorie-rich meal.

Dennis Bramble, Lieberman's old colleague from his days running pigs on treadmills, believes something slightly different, and slightly less grand: that the ability to run allowed *Homo erectus* to compete for the scraps of the savanna, not catch their own prey. After a lion or other large predator had made a kill, it would leave carrion behind, and the scavengers would need to run long distances to beat out the other scavengers and arrive before the dead flesh had spoiled.

Another group of scientists, led by Jamie Bartlett at the University of Colorado Boulder, has done a study that shows that although the butt is critical for endurance running, it actually has many other functions. Bartlett says the gluteus maximus is "akin to a multifunction Swiss Army knife" in that it helps humans to climb, throw, lift, and squat. Bartlett believes that the butt evolved to help *Homo erectus* traverse long distances, but also to help them escape predators—to scamper up the few trees available on the savanna, to squat behind bushes, to move quickly and nimbly away from a predator. She tells me this is fairly obvious if you take a look at a track team. "It's not the distance runners who have big butts, it's the sprinters, jumpers, and the throwers."

Although these scientists differ on the precise reason for the butt muscles' existence, they agree that it is a uniquely human feature that crucially contributed to our evolution. We are humans, you could say, thanks to our butts.

---

One point nine million years ago, the man whose hip bone would become fossil KNM-ER 3228 ran after a wildebeest. His large butt flexed, and the long

tendons that attached his heel to the back of his knee catapulted him forward like a spring. His head, balanced on his spine, bobbed loosely as he ran, the S-curve in his back absorbing the shock of each footfall. His sparse body hair and ample sweat glands kept him cool, and he panted heavily through his mouth as he slowly, steadily, ran after his prey.

On a beautiful October day two million years later, Nick Coury runs up a mountain. His butt muscles flex, his sweat glands release perspiration, his tendons and joints propel him forward like a spring. He passes one horse and then another, climbing Mingus Mountain slowly, one footfall at a time. He uses his gluteal muscles to climb, and then he uses them to run. He doesn't think about the end, or the powerful animals around him. He thinks only about the few feet in front of him. And then, suddenly, Nick realizes that he is winning.

The mountain turns flat, and Nick can see the finish line in the distance. He feels euphoric, flush with the pleasurable endorphins that many call a runner's high (likely another evolutionary adaptation that helps make humans excellent runners). He starts to run as fast as he can, holding nothing back. Tears stream down his face as he crosses the finish line. It has been six hours and fourteen minutes since he started the race, the fastest any runner has ever completed the course. Like the man with hip bone KNM-ER 3228, Nick has outrun all of his four-legged competitors, the first human in Man Against Horse history to do so. Nick hasn't done it for food—he has his vegan goo and a barbecue celebration dinner waiting for him—but simply because he loves to run.

# FAT



**M**uscles serve a certain physiological purpose—they expand and contract, moving bone and sinew up and down, back and forth, allowing us to sit upright, lean side to side, even digest our food—and, as a result, are the easiest part of the butt to study and to understand. But butts, especially women’s butts, do not consist only of muscle. They also have a layer of fat that sits on top of the gluteus maximus—and for many (including me) that layer of fat is thick, and it is complicated.

In nearly every way, fat is far more difficult to study than muscle. A soft tissue, it decomposes after organisms die and leaves no long-term record behind, so evolutionary biologists can’t know for certain how early humans or our hominid ancestors carried it on their bodies. It is very tempting to imagine ancient humans as thin and lithe, to see the earliest *Homo sapiens* as the blueprints for our current rendering of the ideal body, but the truth is that no one knows the size of the breasts or butt of the earliest human females, just as they don’t know the girth of a male *Homo erectus*’s penis or whether he had a beard.

We do know, however, that humans living today are the fattest primates, storing significantly more “white fat”—fat that isn’t easily converted to energy—than other primates, which carry more of the quickly and easily metabolized “brown fat.” According to Duke postdoctoral associate Devjanee Swain-Lenz, this difference is embedded in our DNA. A gene that converts white fat to brown fat is literally turned off in humans, making us biologically more susceptible to fat accumulation.

According to Morgan Hoke, who has studied nutrition in both contemporary and historical human populations in her role as assistant professor of anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania, this development began when nutrition was sparse and early hominids had to rely on fat reserves to survive. It wasn't so much that they were starving; there were just frequent and significant variations in what kind of and how much food was available. To survive, early hominids went through metabolic and genetic changes that allowed them to pack on fat that they could then use as a kind of caloric deep storage in case of emergency. This was necessary for the same reason it was crucial for *Homo erectus* to devise a way to hunt: larger brains need more calories. And although our gluteal muscles helped us to hunt and scavenge for high-calorie meat, we needed reserves of fat on our bodies to make sure that our brains could function even when it was very cold and when food was hard to come by. It is ironic, then, that in the twenty-first-century United States, it is almost impossible to conceive of fat in the way we think of muscle—as a part of the body with a job to do. Instead, fat in any form—whether in food or on bodies—carries layers of negative association: gluttony and decadence, rather than necessity and abundance.

Although all people need fat in order to stay healthy, women need it more than men. Most women have twenty to thirty pounds of fat on their bodies, which is a significant percentage of body mass and a lot of weight to haul around, which would seem to be an evolutionary disadvantage. Studies say the lowest level of body fat for a woman to have and still be considered healthy (that is, not starving) is 8–12 percent. For men, that number is 4–6 percent. One scientist I met with told me that even the thinnest women have a higher percentage of fat on their bodies than any other creature on Earth, with two exceptions: seagoing mammals, and bears just before they go into hibernation. After hearing this fact, I spent the next two weeks repeating it to other women I know. It somehow felt powerful—we have the kind of fat that keeps enormous seagoing creatures warm in Arctic waters, the kind that could get you through winter in a cave in the woods. It also felt delightfully outside of my control. This undeniable scientific reality became an antidote to the perpetual voice in my head that said, *Aren't you just a little bit too fat?* I felt like I had a solid rebuttal

for once: *Fat is part of what it is to be female. My fat is what makes me like a nursing whale, like a mama bear.*

Of course, I am not a large seafaring mammal, nor do I hibernate. Nor do any of the other women I know. A whale cow's blubber may serve many functions, but one is very clear: she needs to stay warm in glacial waters. A bear going into hibernation needs significant reserves to get through the winter. But why does a female human need to store so much fat on her body?

"As a feminist it frustrates me, because I can't come up with any other answer," Hoke tells me, "but it has to do with reproduction. It turns out that pregnancy and breastfeeding are really expensive in terms of energetic cost." She further explains that, as with any animals that utilize sexual reproduction, there are going to be some biological differences between the sexes to accommodate the physical and energetic needs of creating new humans—and there is no question who takes on the primary biological burden. "A sperm basically costs nothing," Hoke explains. "An egg doesn't cost much either, but for humans there is a grueling nine months of childbearing and then breastfeeding, which can go on for a long time." The need for extra reserves is huge, because nutrition is going toward fueling two (or more) bodies and brains. Pregnancy requires the mother to take in approximately three hundred extra calories per day, and some studies indicate that breastfeeding can require even more caloric fuel. If there isn't enough food in the environment, a breastfeeding mother can rely on the fat she stores on her body to feed her babies.

Women may need a significant amount of fat to meet the demands of reproduction, but that fat could be anywhere. We could have fat globules hanging from our elbows; our shoulders and necks could be large and bulbous. But instead, fat gathers in the hips, butt, thighs, and breasts, creating a pattern of curves that now read to us as distinctly feminine—but why? The most straightforward possibility is physiological. We have to carry it where we do because to store it elsewhere might impede our range of motion and disrupt the center of gravity—to have a very fatty shoulder would make us top-heavy; to have very fatty knees would make it hard to walk.

There is also a body of research—conducted by Professor Hoke and other evolutionary anthropologists—that suggests storing fat in the butt and thighs is



safer for us because it's far from vital organs, which don't react well to being surrounded by fatty tissue. Additionally, there is some evidence that women with bigger butts and thighs and smaller waists have fattier breast milk, a positive adaptation for helping babies to grow, particularly in places where there may not be ready access to significant fat in the diet. Hoke suggests that this may indicate that when human females are breastfeeding, they draw on the white adipose fat stored in the thighs and butt to nurture their babies.

The truth is, the butt is an anatomically simple part of the body: it is a joint attached to a few large muscles and covered with a layer of fat. But although we have a good understanding of why we have butt muscles, and even, to some extent, why they are covered in fat, it isn't entirely clear why butts are, for many people, so attractive and what, if anything, this has to do with evolution. In order to answer those questions, to the extent they are even answerable, we need to talk about peacocks.

# FEATHERS



Imagine, if you will, a peacock—that grand and bright pheasant, originally from the Indian subcontinent, that now roams the grounds of children’s zoos and eccentric billionaires’ gardens the world over. The peacock is colorful—he has a bright blue head and opulent, iridescent tail plumage with a distinctive eyespot pattern best seen when he fans his tail high and wide—a tail that can extend up to five feet long. The tail alone makes up about 60 percent of his overall body length and weighs around eleven ounces, quite a bit on a bird that typically weighs around ten pounds.

“The sight of a feather in a peacock’s tail, whenever I gaze at it, makes me sick!” Charles Darwin famously wrote in a letter to Harvard botanist Asa Gray in 1860. It wasn’t the beauty that sickened him, but rather the fact that he was unable to explain the existence of such an enormous, conspicuous, yet seemingly useless part of an animal. Evolution, as we often think of it, prioritizes efficiency, and a peacock’s tail is decidedly not an efficient addition. In fact, it is the opposite—a burdensome appendage, attracting predators with its shimmering color and making it difficult to escape.

Darwin’s theory of natural selection tells us that the members of a species best adapted to their surroundings, and therefore more likely to survive and flourish, will also be more likely to reproduce. If a trait is heritable and helpful, it is passed down to a higher percentage of members of the next generation. In this way, random genetic mutations add up, resulting in organisms better evolved to succeed in their environment—survival of the fittest, as they say. But if it is true that those animals with favorable characteristics are more likely to survive, how do we explain an apparently unnecessary, or even counterproductive,

ornamentation? “This is a real puzzle,” says Chris Haufe, professor and philosopher of science at Case Western Reserve University. “You have all these animals with really costly traits—really bright plumage, bright scaling, bright faces, animals who are always making noise. They’re doing stuff that seems idiotic from a survival perspective. And so you need a way of explaining why it is so widespread.”

Darwin attempted to explain these traits in *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*, his bold follow-up to *On the Origin of Species*. In it, he proposed that while natural selection chooses animals that are best suited to an environment, sexual selection plays a significant role as well. These heritable features, which Darwin called secondary sexual characteristics, make them more attractive to their mates (Darwinian evolution assumes heterosexual mating) and therefore make them more fit. In humans, female hips and butts are considered a secondary sexual characteristic, as are breasts, and may have been selected to look the way they do because of mates’ preferences. That is, male humans, over centuries, *might* have chosen to mate with females who had particular kinds of butts that they found attractive, and thus indirectly altered the body part’s evolution forever. But whether it actually functioned that way and what, exactly, this attraction might mean or how it might work remains unresolved, opening the interpretive floodgates for a separate—and often controversial—field of evolutionary studies.

---

Since the 1990s, the discipline of evolutionary psychology emerged as a popular method for understanding the relationship between sexual attraction and evolution. You can find evolutionary psychology studies in academic journals, but you’ll also find them referenced in the pages of *Maxim* or *Cosmopolitan* or in long Reddit threads attempting to explain why contemporary behaviors or psychological traits—promiscuity, fear of spiders, or male desire for specific female traits, like big butts—may have been advantageous to early humans. These are also the armchair theories I most often hear when I tell people at parties that I’m writing a book about butts. “Don’t big butts signal fertility?”

someone will say as they search for another beer in the back of the fridge. “I’ve heard that women with big butts are smarter,” someone else might add as they plunge their hand into a bowl of chips.

Although these acquaintances are surely just dredging up some half-remembered thing they read long ago in an internet wormhole, I find these comments telling because of what they seem to imply. There are two underlying assumptions being made: first, that big butts are biologically advantageous, and second, that sexual attraction to butts, particularly big butts, is innate and out of our control. Just as we crave sweetness because sugar sustains us, the partygoers seem to suggest that we desire big butts because they are good for us and help us survive. It is somehow natural, and in our biological best interests, to be turned on by prominent butts.

Because evolutionary psychologists often take on pop topics related to sex and attractiveness, magazines use their studies as the basis of click-bait articles like “High Heels Do Have Power over Men, Study Finds” and “How Make-up Makes Men Admire but Other Women Jealous.” These articles offer watered-down evolutionary justifications for common behaviors—women are jealous of other women who wear makeup in the workplace because they perceive the makeup wearers to be sexually dominant; high heels compel a woman to arch her back, an ancient signal of her readiness to mate—instead of cultural ones. Evolutionary psychology isn’t designed to grapple with the seemingly more obvious explanations of human behavior that are rooted in culture, identity, or individual psychological experience. For example, maybe the men in the study were entranced by women wearing high heels because they’ve spent a lifetime absorbing images that equate high heels with sexiness; perhaps women’s jealousy of other women emerges because there are so few opportunities for women in many work environments and women are conditioned to interpret other women as rivals. These explanations are not considered as potential answers to the questions being posed in the studies.

This, then, is part of the reason why evolutionary psychology can be such a tempting mode of thought: it offers evolutionary explanations for behavior that may very well be dictated by cultural or historical forces, which can be a way of offering an excuse. If we took seriously that a lifetime of imbibing unrealistic

beauty standards may be behind our thinking that high heels are sexy, we might feel a responsibility to interrogate ourselves and our assumptions, and even change our views. But if the desire for women in high heels is evolutionary, then there is nothing to be done.

Butts are a particularly rich subcategory for the evolutionary psychologists of popular media. The articles “The Science of Why You’re an Ass Man,” “How the Gluteus Became Maximus,” and “Science Has Finally Figured Out Why Men Like Big Butts” were published in *Men’s Health*, the *Atlantic*, and *Cosmopolitan* in 2014 and 2015, all based on the same evolutionary psychology study. The experiment was conducted at the University of Texas by researchers who were looking to determine the evolutionary origins of sexual desire for women’s butts. The researchers showed drawings to 102 men between ages seventeen and thirty-four that depicted women curving their spines at different angles, sticking their butts out to various degrees. According to the response data, the men preferred women who held a 45-degree angle. Then, in a second study, researchers showed the same photos but included drawings of women with larger butts. The men still preferred the women sticking out their butts. The researchers deduced from this data that a desire for larger butts was actually a desire for women who have a slightly swayed back, which they claimed was an evolutionary adaptation for early hominid females because it allowed them to better support, provide for, and carry out multiple pregnancies. The mechanism for that adaptation is a bit of a long walk: according to the researchers, pregnant females who had backs swayed at 45 degrees had better torque when they reached down to forage for food, which meant that they could gather more nourishment and better feed their babies. It was to the male’s advantage to choose a mate who could provide the most food for their family, and a protruding butt was the visual signal that a female could do just that.

For decades, many biologists have taken considerable exception to evolutionary psychology for a host of reasons. Paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould described the thinking that undergirds these types of studies as the creation of “Just So Stories,” a reference to Rudyard Kipling’s book of children’s fables that offer fanciful explanations for traits like a leopard’s spots or a camel’s hump. According to Professor Haufe, evolutionary psychologists often use survey data

and then create theories that explain the results, whereas evolutionary biologists like Daniel Lieberman rely on experimental research and the fossil record. In the University of Texas study, for example, the researchers came up with the theory that big-buttred women were better able to forage for food, but they provided no experimental data to back it up. This is a fundamental problem that many biologists have with evolutionary psychology: it doesn't adhere to the standards of other sciences that study biological evolution.

Another problem with evolutionary psychology is that it frequently rests on a fundamental assumption that may not be true: that mate choice is always based on detecting and selecting for positive inheritable genetic qualities. For example, a well-known evolutionary psychological theory about the peacock's tail is that only a very tough and resourceful peacock could drag around one of those immense tails, and hence the tail is a way to show the peahen how strong the peacock is. But, according to Haufe, there is no real evidence that mate choice is driven by the ability to detect genes with adaptive features. That is, peahens may not be making choices that have anything to do with virility or strength.

This may sound counterintuitive. It certainly did to me when I first heard it. Because I'd been so steeped in the idea that all animal traits must be adaptive, that every part of us—including our feelings of sexual attraction—must be built to accomplish something for some particular evolutionary purpose, it was hard for me to imagine any other reason why peacocks might have blue heads or human women might have fleshy butts. This mode of thinking is what Gould and evolutionary biologist Richard Lewontin refer to as "adaptationism," a mindset they criticized for decades because it cut off the possibility that certain traits may not serve any purpose, and that the purpose they might serve today may have nothing to do with why and how the trait originated. That is to say: the peacock's tail may not be an adaptation for anything, or it might be an adaptation for something peacocks needed thousands of years ago, but we should not assume that the tails of today's peacocks serve any particular function at all.

---



On a visit to the Peabody Museum of Natural History at Yale University, I open a drawer and find more than twenty green parrots, nearly identical, stuffed with cotton and resting belly up, wings tucked tight against their sides. The drawer smells surprisingly pungent, a combination of mothballs and preservatives, with a touch of something more earthy and animal. When I ask about the odor, Dr. Richard Prum—the William Robertson Coe Professor of Ornithology at Yale and, on this day, my guide to the museum—shrugs and says, “The drawer of penguins smells like oily fish.” It is a surprise to me that the smell of a bird’s food and rotting flesh can persist after decades of sitting in a drawer, but Dr. Prum is unimpressed. These are animals made of flesh. Rot is part of the deal.

Along with the odor come flashes of color: vibrant blue bird backs, opalescent heads, bright orange Mohawk-like feather crowns, a black bird of paradise body that Prum says is probably the blackest black found in nature. An enthusiastic bird lover, he explains how the pigment in the shiny feathers lines up like marbles in a bowl to create the uncanny sheen, how the feathers in the black bird of paradise’s body are precisely angled so that no light can reflect outward, creating a hyper-matte black that offsets the gleaming teal feathers the bird displays in its elaborate mating dance.

The museum’s bird collection is in a large, white room in the Environmental Science Center, full of floor-to-ceiling white cabinets. The lighting is fluorescent, the floor covered with industrial gray tile. The bounty of this room is a testament to what Prum calls the “stamp-collecting” element of biology. Biologists measure the variety of the world of birds in all its particulars, looking to understand the physics of feather pigments or what kinds of larynx allow for different types of song. Dr. Prum—a MacArthur “genius,” a Guggenheim fellow, a professor with his own laboratory—has made a career out of asking these kinds of questions about birds, and in the process has made myriad exciting discoveries, including the fact that there is a direct evolutionary relationship between contemporary birds and dinosaurs.

But I’m not here to learn about feather pigmentation—at least, not explicitly. I’m here because Prum is the champion for a theory about the evolution of ornamentation that pushes against the adaptationist mindset. Building on Lewontin and Gould’s ideas (as well as those of earlier scientists, including

Ronald Fisher and Darwin himself), and pushing back against theories of evolutionary psychology, Prum believes that animals may come to adopt certain aesthetic characteristics not because those traits are adaptive but simply because they are beautiful. This may be because of a sensory bias in the brain—a neurological feature that just prefers shiny things over nonshiny things—or a preference for novelty. But these attributes don't necessarily signal that there is something *better* about the peacock with the extravagant tail. The peahen doesn't like his tail more than others because it suggests he's a strong and fit potential mate, but just because she likes how it's shiny, and blue, and large. Prum bases this theory on a lifetime of studying birds like those in the drawers at his lab, many of which have plumage, skeletons, or songs that make it difficult for them to fly or easy to be spotted by predators. When Prum realized just how poorly adapted many birds were from the perspective of natural selection, he began to wonder why else they might have such inconvenient and beautiful plumage. It was from his ensuing experiments and theorizing that he discovered a new way of thinking about beauty in birds, and, to some extent, in humans.

When I arrived at Dr. Prum's lab at Yale, one of the first things he said was that he was a little bit nervous to talk to me. Although he regularly gives lectures and talks with the media about bird beauty, human beauty is another matter entirely. It's one thing, he says, to put up a slide of a bird of paradise and say, "Look at this beautiful bird," but it'd be another thing entirely if he were to put up a picture of a woman and point to her as the pinnacle of human beauty, or to discuss why her features exemplify those humans innately prefer.

This speaks to one of Prum's problems with the dominant theories in evolutionary psychology: by arguing that peahens or humans are drawn to the physical attributes of potential mates for entirely biological reasons—health or strength or reproductive fitness—we erase the rich variety of ways that humans might be beautiful to one another and shut down the questions that we can ask about beauty. Suggesting that certain attractions are, evolutionarily speaking, "wrong" while others are "correct" takes away from the epic diversity of taste and preference, and simply doesn't comport with the realities of human—or bird—attraction.

Peacock tails might all look the same to us, but they likely look very different to peahens. But the science of how individual peacock variations and individual peahen preferences have together shaped the development of the peacock tail over thousands of years would be far too complicated to trace. Similarly, while the physiology of the butt is scientifically explicable, if the myriad forms it can take—and the myriad reactions it engenders—are the result of sexual selection, the causal history is too complicated to tell. Variation might be due to different adaptive needs or different aesthetic preferences, but anything that smacks of universals—there is one kind of butt that is most attractive, one kind of butt that is most fit—is almost certainly not the case. This is because the contexts that determine our capacity to thrive—whether environmental, cultural, or personal—are always changing and differ for each one of us. As Haufe told me, “Any butt that is not killing you is probably good enough.”

In fact, Haufe takes Prum’s idea one step further. He says that there is no reason to think that big butts, or fancy feathers, are driven by mate preference at all. Big, small, flat, or bubble butts might just exist. And people may like them, or not, for reasons that have nothing at all to do with evolution or biology. Once again echoing Gould and Lewontin’s critique of adaptationist thinking, Haufe says, “We all have preferences for stuff. I like Marvel movies, for example. I don’t need to appeal to evolution to explain why I like them.” Butts may not be so different. We understand the butt as a site of attraction, a site of revulsion, a body part inextricably tied up in associations of race and gender, but those associations don’t come from the layers of bone, muscle, and fat that create the biological reality of the butt. They come from all the layers of meaning, and of history, that we’ve put on top of it.

---

Sarah

---

# LIFE



The National Museum of Natural History building sits on the southeastern edge of the Jardin des Plantes, which takes up seventy acres on the east side of Paris between the Grand Mosque and the Seine, on rue Cuvier, a street named to honor the man who collected the bones and rocks and seeds that are stuffed inside.

Georges Cuvier was, among other things, the most important comparative anatomist in the world in the early nineteenth century, a man who was a crucial part of the rigorous biological discoveries of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, a man whose work helped lay the foundation for biologists like Daniel Lieberman and Richard Prum. He established the field of paleontology, and his discoveries helped to pave the way for Darwin's theory of evolution.

Cuvier's lifetime goal was nothing less than to collect a specimen of every single plant, animal, and mineral in the world and attempt to answer how they came to be. As I walked through the gardens and the buildings, it felt like he might have succeeded. The gardens were divided up into rectangular plots, with every tree and plant noted by an engraved placard displaying its species and region of origin. A cement pool full of *Glaux maritima*—sea milkwort—was situated next to a swampy patch of water cabbage. To me, they both looked like nothing more than weeds, but on the grounds of the museum they were tended, noticed, and named.

Inside, the museum was packed tight, cluttered with the bones of animals, from a miniature bat skull to the monstrous baleen of a blue whale. Most contemporary museums are places of careful curation, of choice: one chair, one skeleton, one coin stand in for many. The National Museum of Natural History

was not that place. It was a place of almost gratuitous fullness, a place that seemed nostalgic for the time of its creation. Every corner of the vast brick hall was full, the skeletons of every animal I could imagine strung together atop wooden plinths, displayed behind polished glass, or suspended from the ceiling. Instead of informational placards designed to help visitors make sense of the jumble, the museum presented even more jumble: a monkey head floating in a jar, his neck splayed open to reveal the anatomy of his throat; the jaws of twenty different kinds of rats encased by individual orblike vitrines; the pancreas of a panther displayed in front of a large piece of blue velvet.

Human bones were littered among those of animals: a *Homo sapiens* skull was arranged next to a chimpanzee's to show both the similarities and the differences. We are all animals, the museum seemed to say; everything alive is part of the same family. But for more than a century, the museum said something else too: some of us are more animal than others. It is among these animal bones that it becomes clear that Cuvier's mission was never just to collect. It was also to establish a hierarchy, to tap into an imagined natural order and determine which species were "higher" and which were "lower," a system that became particularly important when it came to translating his studies to human beings. At the time, many scientists, Cuvier included, were obsessed with the idea that there were people alive on Earth that were in fact another species, a third category between human and animal. Most scientists thought this creature would be found in Africa, undoubtedly an attempt to justify their own assumed racial superiority with science.

"*Fetus humain*," read the cursive text on one yellowing label in front of five small human skeletons, unfurled and standing upright in the back corner of the museum. Nearby, a one-eyed cyclops kitten and a two-headed dog floated in jars of preservative next to a wax model of conjoined human twins. The label simply read, "*Monstres*."

As I looked in this dusty corner, I didn't see order, I saw cruelty. What purpose could this display possibly serve beyond provoking shock and revulsion, particularly with no context, no attempt at education? But I felt uncomfortable not only because of what was there, but also because of what I knew had once been there. I'd come to Paris to learn about the life and legacy of a woman whose

body, and butt, became central to Cuvier's project of ordering humanity. A woman whose remains Cuvier thrust into this collection in 1816, displayed as a prime example of what many at the time referred to as a "Hottentot," a term used in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to describe the people of the Khoe tribe of what is now South Africa.

---

Her name was Sarah Baartman, or at least that is the name that most scholars use when they write about her. Her real name, the one she was given by her parents, is unknown, as are many of the details of her life. The only documentary evidence of her life comes from the individuals and institutions that exploited Baartman and held her in their control: ship's logs, court transcripts, sensational newspapers, scientific textbooks, firsthand accounts by the only people who could write them down—the educated and the wealthy. Rarely does she emerge in the historical record to speak for herself, so in order to piece together her story, scholars have had to closely examine both what is in the archival record and what has been omitted, elided, and suppressed, doing work often called "reading against the grain." It is only through this process that they've been able to find a more complex story of her life.

Baartman, who was Khoe, was born in rural South Africa in the 1770s, a time when the territory was a Dutch colony. The Khoe were an Indigenous pastoral people from southwestern Africa—men herded sheep and cattle, and women gathered berries and insects—whose traditional way of life was disrupted by colonization and intertribal conflict. For decades before Baartman's birth, colonial explorers had sent reports back to Europe of their African travels, describing Khoe women as having long, pendulous labia, a lazy demeanor, and a habit of constantly smoking pipes. They also described what would become the most famous of the Khoe features in the European imagination: large butts. These descriptions would inspire Carl Linnaeus, the father of modern taxonomy, to classify the tribe as "homo sapiens monstrous," a category of half human that included mythical wolf-boys and elephant-headed men.



By the age of ten, Baartman had been captured by the Dutch and was living with her parents on a colonist's farm, working as a servant. Within another decade, both of her parents had died. In the mid-1790s, Baartman was sold to Peter Caesars, a free Black man who was himself a servant to a German butcher in Cape Town, a bustling, cosmopolitan port city full of soldiers, tradesmen, and travelers from all over the world. Under Dutch law, free Black people were not citizens or on equal footing with whites. They had to carry a pass when they walked the streets, they were required to dress simply, and they weren't allowed to make purchases on credit. When the British arrived in South Africa in 1795, the laws regarding credit changed, and free Black men like Caesars went into debt buying slaves and servants of their own.

In the first years that Baartman was owned by Caesars, she gave birth to three children, all of whom died. She may have, in some sense, been married, but if that was the case, that man likely died as well. She was, essentially, alone. It was during this time that Caesars decided he would conscript his young servant into a new kind of duty. He asked her to begin "performing" for sailors in Cape Town's military hospital to earn money and help pay off his debt. Historians don't know exactly what the show entailed, but it is likely that Caesars had Baartman display her large butt to the crowd. Soon, she became something of a local celebrity.

One of the people who saw the show was Alexander Dunlop, a Scottish military doctor with an entrepreneurial bent. Dunlop was low on funds and preparing to return to England, where he hoped to improve his fortunes, and proposed a plan to Caesars that he dreamed would make them both rich. The empire was growing, and explorers were returning with the bounty of their travels so that scientists, government officials, gentlemen, and the lower classes of London could see the fruits of the wars and voyages subsidized by their tax dollars. Botanical specimens, pelts, and even human curiosities were available for members of all classes to view at various museums, scientific societies, and freak shows.

Dunlop was eager to capitalize on this fascination with all things "exotic" and bring Baartman to England, where he intended to feature her in a Piccadilly freak show, wearing the clothes of her tribe as she played her guitar. It was a plan

built in part on the fame Baartman had accrued in Cape Town, but also on Dunlop's experience in Georgian England, which had become fascinated with butts in general. Full (although not necessarily large) women's butts had, for centuries, been one component of a voluptuous silhouette that became synonymous with femininity and beauty, in part because of the way that silhouette was employed in both Paleolithic and Greek statuary. The statues that displayed this shape, called Venuses, named after the Roman goddess of love, fertility, beauty, and prosperity, were a celebration of a holistic image of femininity rather than a beauty ideal focused on one physical part (the *Venus Callipyge*, or "Venus with the beautiful butt," being one notable exception). European Renaissance painting had also commonly represented women's butts, perhaps most famously in the work of Peter Paul Rubens, whose depictions of full-figured women were created at a time when thinness was increasingly equated with rationality. Thin men were considered more intelligent, and the ideal woman—an irrational creature, Rubens thought—was plump and round and "white as snow," part of a project of elevating whiteness (and suggesting that women weren't very bright) that was already happening in the sixteenth century.

Although associations between shapely butts and femininity, beauty, and irrationality were surely present in the Georgian London that Dunlop knew so well, in the early nineteenth century there was a new mania for butts spreading through the British capital. Londoners were obsessed with butts: there were fart clubs where people gathered and drank different juices to see what sounds and odors they would produce. Newspaper cartoons were full of ample-bottomed white women—in one, a big-butt woman is merrily taking a bath as a group of men peer at her through a crack in the door. Dunlop's plan was to provide Londoners with a living stereotype of a large-bottomed "Hottentot" woman—a symbol of the growing empire and a fantasy of African hypersexuality. His hope was that the endeavor would make him rich.

Some scholars think that Baartman was promised money and opportunity before she left South Africa, although there is no documented contract between herself and Dunlop, or anyone else. Though evidence suggests that she refused to go without Caesars, it's hard to know whether she felt she had an actual choice in the matter, even if she agreed to the arrangement. Her freedom to

make decisions for herself about where she could go and when had long been legally restricted, and her economic straits narrowed her opportunities further. In her lifetime, South Africa passed back and forth between Dutch and British hands, a period in which the laws governing slavery, race, and servitude existed in a state of uneasy flux. Although the British Empire abolished the slave trade in 1807, slavery itself was very much alive in the British Empire until 1833, and de facto slavery and forced labor lingered for decades longer.

What we do know is that in the spring of 1810, Baartman boarded the HMS *Diadem*, a decommissioned British troop ship that had fought in Spain. She was accompanied by Dunlop, Caesars, and a Black boy named Matthias whose status was marked as “servant” in the records so that Dunlop wouldn’t be accused of transporting slaves. After a months-long Atlantic passage, during which Baartman would have likely been horribly seasick and trapped belowdecks as the only woman on board, the ship landed in Chatham, England, in July 1810.

When she disembarked, Baartman was wearing the same clothes she had been wearing when she left Cape Town—a servant’s smock and rawhide shoes, hardly enough to protect against the harsh winds and salty spray of the long voyage. She took a stagecoach with Dunlop and Caesars from Chatham to London, clattering up the Old Kent Road with a trunk full of African goods and a smelly giraffe skin—another artifact from the cape for sale—strapped to the top.

By the end of the summer, a cartoonish image of Baartman was plastered on storefronts, street corners, and newspaper stalls across London, depicting her standing in profile, emphasizing an enormous bottom, large and high and round. In the drawing, her likeness is all but nude, wearing only vaguely tribal ornaments, her breasts obscured by the placement of her arm. A pipe sticks out of her mouth, and smoke curls from its tip. In large, bold letters, the poster advertised the show: “The Hottentot Venus just arrived from the interior of Africa; The Greatest Phenomenon ever exhibited in this country; whose stay in the Metropolis will be but short.”

The first performance took place at 225 Piccadilly, in a part of town where Londoners came to experience the strangeness and newness of an expanding world through “freak shows”—exhibitions featuring albino children and so-called Siamese twins and giants. Piccadilly was a place where the scientific and

the salacious merged, and everyone from the poor Irish immigrants who cleaned the city's hearths to the great men of finance gathered, creating a new kind of intermingled public space that brought many together to participate in the degradation of people like Baartman.

The daily show began the same way each time: Baartman emerged from behind a velvet curtain on a three-foot-high stage at the front of a well-lit room. She wore no corset or underwear—only a skintight, skin-colored body stocking, her nipples clearly visible through the fabric. The spectacle was later described in the London *Times*: “She is dressed in a color as nearly resembling her skin as possible. The dress is contrived to exhibit the entire frame of her body, and the spectators are even invited to examine the peculiarities of her form.”

The producers wanted Baartman to look as “African” as possible, so they adorned her with ostrich-eggshell beads, jangling bracelets, and ostrich-feather cuffs, artifacts that had been brought from Africa but weren't all Khoe. She also wore her own small tortoiseshell necklace, a traditional token presented upon first menstruation to Khoe girls and one of the only authentic artifacts that would travel with her throughout her life. Around her waist, Baartman wore an elaborate girdle designed to highlight the parts of her body that her handlers knew Londoners would most want to see. They made sure her large bottom was visible and her genitals were enticingly hidden by a leather flap that echoed descriptions of Khoe genitalia sent back by explorers. They very often had her smoke a pipe.

When the show began, she entered a roomful of women with bows in their hair and men in high-necked collars, craning their heads for a look. Caesars would lead Baartman around the stage, commanding her in Dutch to turn, sit, and walk. She then sang Khoe songs, played the guitar, and danced, in what was perhaps an attempt to elevate the show beyond lurid spectacle to anthropological showcase. Finally, spectators willing to pay a bit more were invited to approach the stage and feel her bottom, pinching it to make sure it was real or poking it with an umbrella, turning Baartman into whatever they wanted her to be: a body to be reviled, a specimen to be studied, an object to be desired, a symbol to be controlled. As they squealed with delight and horror, she very often scowled.

Just as Dunlop had hoped, the show quickly became a must-see. Reports of the performance circulated quickly in newspapers, and Baartman soon began receiving invitations for private engagements. The audience was filled with both men and women, Black and white, from all socioeconomic classes. After a day onstage at Piccadilly, she would be carted off to the homes of wealthy Londoners, where she would display her body in ornate sitting rooms, singing before dukes and lords. On her nights off, Baartman worked as a servant to Dunlop and Caesars, cooking and cleaning alongside two African boys. Her days were long and likely lonely. It was imperative to the success of the show that Baartman be understood as a specimen rather than a person, so her social life was severely limited.

Soon, newspapers began to report that Baartman was becoming visibly distressed and angry during performances. Once, she tried to hit a male spectator with her guitar. Another time, she yelped and sighed audibly. “She frequently heaved deep sighs; seemed anxious and uneasy; grew sullen,” the London *Times* reported. Baartman was doing what she could to protest, but her resistance only heightened her popularity, her performances evolving from a titillating and exploitative display of African sexuality to a live enactment of the master-slave relationship and the “natural order” of the races. The audience was only too happy to believe Caesars when he claimed that Baartman was a “wild beast” and that he needed to contain her for her own good.

When abolitionist groups learned of the situation, they took up Baartman’s cause. Zachary Macaulay, one of the most famous British abolitionists of the day, called her “a foreigner, and a female, too, in worse than Egyptian bondage.” Slavery had been outlawed three years earlier, but here was a slave in their midst, he argued, and she needed to be saved. For Macaulay and the abolitionist organizations he worked with, Baartman was a symbol and potential test case for the issues they’d been debating for decades. Still, to fully champion Baartman’s cause was complicated. Most abolitionists at the time were motivated by traditional strictures of Christian morality, which meant they also had strong opinions about sex, nudity, and vice. Baartman may have been a captive, but they also saw her as a flagrantly sexual temptation.

By October, a very public debate raged in the London newspapers. Was Baartman free? Was she enslaved? A description in the London *Times* suggested something closer to the latter: “The Hottentot was produced like a wild beast, and ordered to move backwards and forwards, and come out and go into her cage, more like a bear on a chain than a human being.” By this time, Caesars had moved out of the shared home and was no longer involved in the show, so it was from Dunlop that Macaulay demanded documentation and witnesses from Cape Town who would corroborate their story that Baartman was in London legally and under her own free will. Dunlop pushed back, claiming that everything was aboveboard and that she could leave any time she wished. (No one asked about the other two African “servants” living with them.) As the men volleyed back and forth, Baartman’s popularity continued to grow, as did Dunlop’s profits.

On November 24, 1810, the case went to trial, but Baartman wasn’t present. Her defenders—an abolitionist organization called the African Institution—were worried she would come to court dressed indecently, and the judge didn’t know if they could find anyone in London who spoke the language they called “low Dutch” (Afrikaans) to translate for her. As the court came to order, she was busy performing to a packed theater in Piccadilly, forced to miss the proceedings that would determine her fate. Before long, however, it was decided that a verdict could not be properly reached without the complainant’s voice. With minimal effort, they found two Afrikaans speakers—London was a diverse place, and the empire brought many South Africans aside from Baartman into its borders—and Baartman was summoned.

Dunlop must have realized that her testimony was going to be a problem, because, on November 27, he took her to a notary to sign a contract that was backdated to March 20. The contract explicitly addressed Baartman’s primary concerns and promised that Dunlop would split the profits with her, eventually pay for her return voyage home, provide her with medical attention, and give her warmer clothes when she performed. She was shivering onstage with so little on.

Until she testified, no one had uttered Baartman’s name aloud, referring to her only as “a female of the Hottentot Tribe,” the “Hottentot Venus,” or just “the female.” Baartman gave evidence in the apartments where she lived, dressed

regally in European clothes. She told the examiners about her past—where she grew up, how her father died, and how she met Dunlop and Caesars—and testified that she was satisfied with her situation in England. She liked the country, she explained. She was paid by her masters and had no wish to return home. The notes from the trial say that the notary from the state asked Baartman “whether she preferred either to return to the Cape of Good Hope or stay in England and that she replied—Stay here.”

It’s difficult to know why, exactly, she testified as she did that day—perhaps she thought she had already gotten what she wanted, that the men who had brought her to England were good for the money they’d promised. Or maybe she felt that she simply couldn’t speak freely, fearing retribution. There was also concern about what would happen to her if she were to be released from her captors. Though one abolitionist claimed, “There are persons ready to take her,” it was a vague promise, likely offering little comfort to a woman who did not speak English, had no financial security, and was marooned in a strange, cold land.

The court determined that Baartman “was under no restraint, and she was happy in England.” Thanks to all the free publicity the trial provided, her show continued to sell out through the winter, and after the details of her supposed financial agreement with Dunlop became public, the cartoon drawings of her included a new feature: piles of gold and bags of money.

Over the next three years, Baartman toured Britain, performing in London, Brighton, Bath, Manchester, and Ireland. While in Manchester, she was baptized, declaring her name as Sarah in the baptismal record. She traveled with Dunlop until he died in 1812, and then began traveling with a man named Henry Taylor. Little is known about Taylor or his relationship with Baartman beyond the fact that he took her to Paris in 1814, where she lived and worked around the edges of the Palais Royal, an area known for political unrest, vice, and pamphleteering. Baartman was already famous when she got to France, and false rumors about her spread quickly: some said she was secretly married, while others claimed she was a sex worker.

Baartman lived on one end of the Palais and worked at the other, doing a version of the same show she had been performing since her time in Cape Town.



She danced and sang nearly nude, smoking a pipe and displaying her butt. The show proved once again to be enormously popular; France had its own stake in colonial Africa, and the nation, like Britain, maintained a feverish curiosity about what they perceived to be the highly sexual Indigenous people of that continent. To maximize profits, Taylor increased the number of hours Baartman performed every day from six to ten. At night, she continued her private performances for the wealthy and the powerful. Soon, she grew ill from exhaustion, and by 1815, she could no longer perform.

In January of that year, the *Journal Général de France* declared, “The Venus Hottentot has changed owners.” The language used in this newspaper declaration revealed a stark difference between Paris and London. In London, slavery was illegal, an evil to be rooted out. In Paris, slavery was basically still allowed (although technically illegal since the French Revolution) and there was far less of a debate about the morality of buying, selling, and owning human beings. There was no longer any question about whether or not Baartman was a free person. She now belonged to a man called S. Reaux.

Reaux was an animal trainer with ties to Paris’s scientific community, who sold animal carcasses for dissection and study to comparative anatomists interested in hereditary links between species. Baartman’s performances had always been vaguely scientific—Dunlop and Caesars had all but explicitly marketed her as a specimen of Africanness, a living link between humans and apes—and Reaux knew that Parisian scientists would be interested in examining her. He arranged for her to pose for a group that included Cuvier, his assistant, and three artists at the National Museum of Natural History in exchange for a hefty sum.

On the day that Georges Cuvier was meant to examine her, Baartman arrived at the Jardin in costume but was quickly asked by the assembled group to undress completely—something she had always refused to do. Cuvier and his colleagues argued that they weren’t interested in what they saw as showman’s artifice, a costume put together by Europeans and a skin-colored stocking that gave the illusion of nudity; they wanted to see her “objectively.”

They asked to see Baartman’s “organs of generation,” which meant her butt and her genitalia—parts that, for two centuries, scientists and philosophers used

to attempt to prove that the Indigenous people of South Africa were, in fact, a different species from Europeans. Cuvier and his colleagues were eager to make the determination for themselves. At first Baartman resisted, but eventually she agreed to pose mostly nude. Perhaps it was the large payment promised to her and Reaux, or perhaps it was because she had little choice. Whatever the reason, she posed in the halls of the National Museum of Natural History with only a handkerchief to cover herself. The men drew pictures of her in profile, her butt once again enormous and central in the renderings, but Cuvier didn't get the thing he most wanted: "She kept her apron concealed," he wrote later. "Either between her thighs or still more deeply." After days of examination, Baartman grew sicker and, eventually, either from physical pain or emotional exhaustion, began to more heavily drink the brandy that Reaux provided.

---

Like so many details of her life, the date of Sarah Baartman's death is not certain. It was sometime in the last days of December 1815 or the early days of January 1816. She likely died of tuberculosis or pneumonia.

In death, she was once again exploited. Some reports suggest that Reaux sold her body to Cuvier, while others say that the scientist was granted permission from the Parisian police to take possession of it. Either way, in January 1816, Cuvier meticulously dissected Baartman's body in the name of science. He began by making casts of the corpse so that his team could create a lifelike statue to study. He removed her brain and put it into a jar of embalming fluid. Then he turned his attention to her labia, that intimate part that in life she had kept so adamantly private. He molded them in wax and removed them to another jar of preservative for further inspection. After a complete dissection, he boiled all the flesh off of her bones.

Once Cuvier finished his dissection of Baartman, he added the parts of her body he'd saved—her bones, her brain, her labia, and the cast he'd made of her body—to his vast collection at the National Museum of Natural History, where they were exhibited in case 33.

In his autopsy report, Cuvier reduces Baartman to a specimen. He notes that her large bottom was made of fat, not muscle, and describes her breasts and areolas, providing measurements and descriptions of the colors. He also discusses her labial folds at length. The examination was a kind of molestation in the name of science. At the end of the report, he drew the conclusion that Baartman was “a closer relative of the great apes than of humans.”

---

Standing in Cuvier’s museum, looking into the case where Baartman’s remains had been exhibited, I found myself imagining the objects that had once been there. I’d seen photos of them, and they were excruciating to look at—body parts in jars displayed in large, wood-framed vitrines—the trappings of a museum used to sanitize a history bloated with cruelty. But as I thought more about my feelings of outrage, I realized that there was another feeling there, too: a desire to distance myself and my own time from the long-ago past. I wanted to believe that, in my lifetime, curators and visitors would find the practice of ogling Baartman’s human remains barbaric and unthinkable. I wanted to believe that the Londoners who paid an extra shilling to poke Baartman with an umbrella were profoundly different from me and completely alien to the era I’m living in. And while there are, of course, tremendous and meaningful differences between 1810 and 2020, the story of Sarah Baartman is important not only as a troubling tale of a large-butt woman who was mistreated in the early nineteenth century, but because of the many ways her life, display, and dissection have remained relevant across the centuries.

The white, Western understanding of women’s butts changed the moment Sarah Baartman came to England, and it has never been the same since. The butt, and particularly the large butt, became stubbornly associated with the exotic and the erotic, associations that are never far away today. Baartman’s popularity, which was immense in her own time, grew, evolved, and became distorted over many decades after her death. Even when enough time had passed that most people no longer knew her name, the legacy of her dissection and

display lingered in the ways that butts so often do: in jokes, suggestions, and visual echoes.

Janell Hobson, professor of women's, gender, and sexuality studies at the State University of New York at Albany, has written extensively on Sarah Baartman, the history of Black women's beauty and bodies, and the meanings of Black women's butts in both the past and the present. Before trying to understand the long and complex legacy of Sarah Baartman's life, I ask her to first help me understand what, exactly, was going on in Europe in 1810 that made Sarah Baartman so incredibly popular.

According to Hobson, Baartman's display helped to bolster two of the biggest racial projects of the past two centuries: colonialism and the continuation of slavery. In both popular culture and the annals of science, Baartman was used as evidence that African people were more primitive than Europeans and therefore in need of Christian, European moral guidance. This would become one of the major justifications that European countries used in the colonization of Africa over the next two centuries.

Baartman's body was also used as evidence of the false belief that African women were inherently more sexual than white women, a premise that had become vitally important in Europe and the United States when she appeared in London in 1810. In the aftermath of the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, the many people who benefited from slavery on both sides of the Atlantic searched for a way to continue the practice of enslavement without bringing new enslaved people from Africa. "If you're cutting off the supply of captive Africans who are being transported to the Americas, but slavery is still happening in the Americas, now you need to [find a way to] perpetuate the next generation of slaves," Hobson explains. "In the Americas, laws required that any children that were born to enslaved women become enslaved. The law basically legitimized rape." Hobson explains that the display of Sarah Baartman as a hypersexual specimen—a point repeatedly made in scientific papers and in popular accounts through depictions and descriptions of her butt—offered a kind of evidence for the belief that Black women were, by their nature, sexual, a logic that many used to justify the rape of enslaved women. "This is how the Christian slave owners absolve themselves of any sexual violence," Hobson says.

And yet, although Baartman's body was being used to justify widespread racist viewpoints, most of those who came to ogle her in Piccadilly or at the Palais in Paris probably believed the show to be nothing more than a silly bit of spectacle, which made it easy for them to gawk, and laugh, at Baartman's body without fully considering the larger implications. "Folks were definitely being entertained," says Hobson. "But the show also perpetuated ideas around African savagery and primitive Black womanhood. [It] brings forth the tales that they already had about savage Africans running around naked on the continent. So when white people were looking at Sarah Baartman, they were projecting all of this stuff they'd already inculcated in the culture."

But Baartman's popularity was not confined to her own lifetime, nor was the racial ideology that had become attached to her image. Well after her death, the fetishization of Baartman's body remained stitched into the popular culture of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. There were songs written and plays performed about her. Her likeness was featured on a deck of playing cards, and she was satirized in pantomime for the same crowds who had paid to see her perform in life. Over and over again, in pornographic novels and newspaper cartoons of the Victorian era, there are sexualized likenesses of large-butt Black women that closely resemble the images that Baartman's captors circulated of her in London and Paris. As Sander Gilman, a historian who has studied the story and legacy of Baartman, says, "Female sexuality [became] linked to the image of the buttocks, and the quintessential buttocks [were] those of the Hottentot."

Sometimes these images were explicitly of Baartman, but more often they portrayed the "Hottentot Venus," a term that first referred to Baartman but was later applied to other Khoen women brought to Europe to serve as colonial curiosities in her stead. Baartman had become a commercial entity, her individual identity stripped away, and the name that had been coined for her became a blanket term for others like her. An image from 1829, for example, depicts a large-butt, nude Black woman—labeled "Hottentot Venus"—displayed as an attraction at a ball given by the Duchess du Berry in Paris. In an engraving from 1850, a white man looks at a woman labeled "Hottentot Venus" through a telescope; the lens is trained on her large butt. Many of these women

met similar fates as Baartman in death as well: in British, French, and even South African museums, scientists stripped Khoe women's corpses of their skin and stuffed them for display, emblems of the Indigenous South African. Baartman wasn't the only large-butt Khoe woman to be put on display in the dioramas and cabinets of curiosities that were the cornerstone of early anthropological museums. She was simply the first.

# LEGACY



**A**s people were playing bridge with cards adorned with Baartman's likeness, scientists were continuing the work that Cuvier had begun with her autopsy, trying to scientifically reinscribe the ideas of racial difference that he had first codified.

Janell Hobson explains that, in the eighteenth century, scientists had used skin color as the fundamental way to determine difference between the races. But in the early nineteenth century, they began to shift from skin color to anatomy and body shape as a means to order humans and codify racial differences and hierarchies, and often used Baartman as evidence for this changing logic. The Khoe people were light skinned compared to people from equatorial Africa, which would have at one time suggested to European scientists and philosophers they were a higher order of African. And yet, the Khoe were often the people that nineteenth-century European scientists fixated on and determined to be the lowest in the racial order, using what they claimed to be a distinctly Khoe body feature (although this, too, is a dubious idea)—their butts—as evidence of what they believed was their place at the lowest end of the human hierarchy.

Cuvier's written autopsy report of Baartman's dissection—reprinted at least twice during his lifetime—was crucial to this new form of racial order and was widely cited as a source by other scientists. But there were at least seven other autopsies of Khoe women written by major scientists in the nineteenth century, all of which were done to advance similar ideas. Scientists went into those dissections with a thesis they wanted to prove—that Khoe women were the lowest in the racial order—and they always claimed to prove it.

But it wasn't only the anatomists who were interested in the bodies, and butts, of Khoe women. In his 1853 book, *The Narrative of an Explorer in a Tropical South Africa*, a statistician named Francis Galton, who was deeply interested in heredity and race, reported his desperation to see a "Hottentot" woman naked so that he might "obtain accurate measurements of her shape." When the Khoe women he encountered on his trip to South Africa refused to be studied, Galton found a woman whom he described as "turning herself about to all points of the compass, as ladies who wish to be admired usually do," and measured the angles of the woman's body with a sextant from a few meters away. Then, despite her protests, he calculated her proportions—the largeness of her butt, the size of her head—using trigonometry.

Although it was primarily the butts of Khoe women that tantalized the public, it was Galton's interest in the cranium that ultimately became the cornerstone of a new field of study, which he called "eugenics," a word that literally means "well born." For much of the nineteenth century, scientists in both Europe and the United States measured and remeasured the skulls of people from around the world, attempting to find proof for a conclusion they already believed to be true: that white people of European descent were the most evolved species on the planet, and therefore the most intelligent and civilized.

Galton and other eugenicists not only asserted that white people were of a higher order of human than Black and Asian people; they were also profoundly interested in ordering people whom we would now consider to be white. These classifications of whiteness were always in a state of flux through the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the United States, although they generally followed a similar pattern: Northern Europeans were considered to be a superior race than Southern Europeans, Jews, and Irish people. Before the Civil War, books like Sharon Turner's *The History of the Anglo-Saxons* and Ralph Waldo Emerson's *English Traits* helped to define Englishness in contrast to Irishness, an ethnicity that was situated just above Black people, and sometimes considered partly Black, in the United States during the mid-nineteenth century. That designation in the racial order only changed when a new wave of immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe arrived in the United States and took their place in the hierarchy. In 1899, economist William Z. Ripley published the



enormously popular *Races of Europe*, which classified Europeans more broadly than Emerson and Turner, organizing them into Teutonic, Alpine, and Mediterranean categories, using cranial measurements, face and nose shape, skin and eye color, and height to determine their place within the system. He also ranked them in that order, placing Germans and Northern Europeans on top and Southern Europeans at the bottom. As with all racial ordering systems, Ripley's made no scientific sense—Ripley himself bemoaned the way that head shape, hair color, and height (his three major racial traits) aren't reliably correlated—but these discrepancies did little to dissuade Ripley or make his project less popular.

These fluctuating racial rankings permeated American science, philosophy, and popular culture in the nineteenth century, and body parts—whether the nose, the head, or the butt—were always components of the systems used to determine what race a person belonged to. Bodies had come to carry a significant amount of racial meaning, and those meanings were cropping up not only in scientific and intellectual circles, but also in the pages of a new kind of publication aimed at women: fashion magazines. *Godey's Lady's Book*, consistently one of the most popular women's magazines in the nineteenth century, published its first issue in 1830. It was in this antebellum era that the first wave of Irish immigration was arriving by the boatload and the Second Great Awakening was inspiring a renewed fervor for both religion and self-discipline, historical events that would help to form the ideological backbone of the magazine. In 1836, *Godey's* hired an editor named Sarah Hale, and it was under Hale's tenure that, according to scholar Sabrina Strings, the perverse logic that equates thinness in women with morality, beauty, and whiteness first began to emerge. In the pages of *Godey's*, there were few conspicuous butts, which had become associated with Blackness, foreignness, and hypersexuality. In fact, largeness generally had become equated with Africanness. Instead, Hale offered images of thin, buttless women as an ideal of Anglo-Saxon Protestant beauty. According to Strings, in Hale's *Godey's*, the thin woman is morally disciplined and the woman who best embodies racial superiority.

But what, exactly, was up with this nineteenth-century obsession with the Black butt? Why did the butt become associated so potently with Black female

sexuality? According to Sander Gilman, by the middle of the nineteenth century, the butt had become a proxy for female genitalia. That is, the butt of someone like Sarah Baartman implied hypersexuality because, for the scientists and gawking public of the nineteenth century, it was as if they were looking at a vulva. It was commonly assumed that the big butt of a Black woman implied that she had oversized genitalia, and such genitalia indicated both increased sexual appetite and a biological difference between a Black woman and a white woman. This association between vulva and butt may seem strange, because the two body parts are so different and have such radically different functions, but in the scientific literature of the era, these two most intimate parts of a woman's anatomy are consistently conflated. Rarely were Baartman's labia and her backside spoken of separately.

By the end of the nineteenth century, anthropologist Abele de Blasio advanced this association between large butts and hypersexuality even further when he published a series of studies on big-buttred, white sex workers in an effort to establish a link between sex workers of any race and the women he called "Hottentots." He published images of white sex workers with large, high butts in profile that echoed the widely known images of Baartman, suggesting that any woman who is sexually deviant might have a big butt, and, therefore, a big butt was a sign of sexual deviance. According to de Blasio, for a woman to have a big butt, regardless of race, was indicative of an excessive sexual appetite.

In 1905, physician and reformer Havelock Ellis published volume 4 of his epic six-volume work *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*. Overall, the project was an attempt to write about human sexuality in a way that pushed beyond the taboos of the Victorian era. Ellis believed that sex was a healthy expression of love, discussed masturbation openly, and questioned taboos around homosexuality. Unfortunately, his views on butts weren't quite so enlightened. In this fourth volume, whose first appendix is the poetically titled "The Origins of the Kiss," he attempts to understand how each of the five senses is used in human attraction. For Ellis, there is an absolute, objective scale of beauty. Published after Darwin's *On the Origin of Species*, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, volume 4, foreshadows the arguments of the evolutionary psychologists of the late twentieth century by suggesting that butts and breasts are adaptive, sexually

selected features: “Among most of the peoples of Europe, Asia, and Africa, the chief continents of the world, the large hips and buttocks of women are commonly regarded as an important feature of beauty.” At the top is the European woman, who Ellis claims is the most beautiful and who is admired the most by all people on Earth. At the bottom of Ellis’s beauty scale are Black people. Butts are the first, and “the most feminine” secondary sex characteristic that Ellis examines in a litany that includes small toes, large eye sockets, and broad middle incisor teeth. He points out that Europeans “frequently seek to attenuate rather than accentuate the protuberant lines of the feminine hip,” while nearly everywhere else (besides Japan), “large hips and buttocks are regarded as a mark of beauty.” He then gets himself into a tricky paradox. He says that large hips are necessary for birthing large-brained babies and that Europeans have the largest hips. But, according to Ellis, African people have large butts *because* they have small hips. He suggests that this is some form of aesthetic compensation for their small pelvises. Here, once again, are the strange maneuvers necessary for racial ordering to work. Ellis asserts that European women have big hips but flat butts, and African women have small hips but big butts. Despite the myriad counterexamples and dubious evidence, Ellis was intent on devising a way to demonstrate that Black people have smaller brains than white people, and he, like many scientists and thinkers in the nineteenth century, used butts to prove this point.

By the end of the nineteenth century, Galton’s theory of eugenics had traveled to the United States, where it permeated both scientific and popular thought. Although today most people understand eugenics as a grotesque and cruel turn in global thought that led to mass genocide during World War II, in the early twentieth century, eugenics was wildly and pervasively popular. Mainstream scientists, politicians, and reformers across party lines openly supported it, including the first six presidents of the twentieth century. Nearly every biology department in the country, including at Stanford, Princeton, Harvard, and the University of Michigan, taught eugenics, and mainstream publications like the *New York Times* and the *Atlantic* regularly published articles that celebrated it.

Eugenicists sorted people, and bodies, into two basic categories: fit and unfit. They believed that problems like poverty and crime were not derived from systemic inequity, racism, or class disparity, but instead from bad genes: poor people bred more poor people, criminals made more criminals. The best way to end suffering, in their view, was to prevent the “unfit” from reproducing, and encouraging the “fit” to have more children.

In order to accomplish this goal, eugenicists had, by the end of the 1930s, created robust sterilization programs in thirty-two states and Puerto Rico, ultimately sterilizing more than sixty thousand people against their will because they were poor, disabled, mentally ill, or placed in the catchall category of “feeble-minded.” Although sterilization laws in the United States were often challenged in court, they were usually upheld as constitutional, including in the landmark 1927 Supreme Court decision *Buck v. Bell*. By the 1930s, the Nazis modeled their own eugenics program after the practices and policies in California, where more than twenty thousand people were sterilized. Even after the atrocities of World War II, sterilization programs in the United States continued for decades in many state hospitals, and as recently as 2010, women incarcerated in the California prison system were sterilized against their will. Although eugenics and the dubious science of racial classification, like the display of Sarah Baartman at Piccadilly, may seem to exist in a distant past, they actually powerfully live in the present, in the form of both contemporary sterilization programs and the theories and prejudices that undergird the way bodies are discussed and classified. As we will see, the ordering of bodies according to shape, size, skin color, and ability—the legacy of these nineteenth- and early twentieth-century racial projects—are woven into our understanding of what constitutes a body that is desirable, healthy, and, in some sense, correct.

---

As the racial scientists of the nineteenth century ordered and reordered humanity, Sarah Baartman’s remains stood sealed inside case 33 at Cuvier’s museum of natural history for more than a century. In 1889, they left the museum for six months, when they were displayed at the Esposition Universelle

in Paris, a celebration of France that attracted thirty-two million visitors from around the world. In 1937, they were transferred to the Musée de l'Homme, where they remained on public display until 1982, when they were removed to the museum's back rooms following public protest. In 1994, Baartman's remains went on display a final time, for an exhibition at the Musée d'Orsay called *Ethnographic Sculpture in the 19th Century*, where the curators still used the language of Baartman's captors, describing her as the "Venus Hottentot." For more than 175 years after her death, well into living memory, visitors could gawk at Baartman's embalmed body parts at Paris's most vaunted institutions.

In the 1990s, after decades of relative obscurity, Sarah Baartman's story was becoming central to new histories of science, race, and the African diaspora thanks to the work of scholars like Sander Gilman and artists like Elizabeth Alexander and Suzan-Lori Parks. In South Africa, as apartheid was coming to an end, a lawyer and historian named Mansell Upham brought Baartman's story to the attention of the Griqua, an ethnic group who claimed Khoë heritage and therefore saw Baartman as one of their ancestors and her story as central to their own Indigenous identity. In 1995, the leaders of the Griqua approached Nelson Mandela and the French embassy to ask that Baartman's remains be repatriated to South Africa.

Mandela sent Professor Phillip Tobias—a paleoanthropologist and one of South Africa's most esteemed scientists—to Paris for negotiations. There he met with considerable opposition—the director of the Musée de l'Homme strenuously opposed the repatriation of Baartman's remains on two grounds: precedent (the museum had thousands of human bones and other remains in its collection from around the world and he did not want to return them all), and offense that the story of Baartman situated Cuvier, one of France's most celebrated scientists, as a racist, colonialist, and perpetrator of sexual assault.

The negotiations went on for six years, seemingly intractable, until French senator Nicolas About intervened and brought a bill to the National Assembly that required the museum to return Baartman's remains to South Africa. It passed unanimously in 2002, and in April of that year, they were finally returned to Hankey, South Africa, near the village where she is thought to have been born.

On August 9, 2002, more than seven thousand people gathered for a funeral service that included both Indigenous Khoe practices and Christian burial rites, an acknowledgment of Baartman's heritage as well as her conversion and baptism. Herbs were burned to purify the air, performers sang Christian hymns and played traditional Khoe music, and aloe wreaths were placed on Baartman's coffin. South African president Thabo Mbeki made a speech that situated Baartman as a symbol of the history of South Africa. "The story of Sarah Baartman is the story of the African people," he said. "It is the story of the loss of our ancient freedom." And then a pile of rocks was laid upon her grave, as was traditional for Khoe people in the eighteenth century, her life finally commemorated, as best it could be, on her own terms.

In the twenty years since, Baartman has become an important symbol in South Africa and as a part of the African diaspora. In South Africa, there are regular debates about what the story of Sarah Baartman means and how she should be represented, including a decade-long struggle to remove a statue created upon her repatriation that many women found offensive. Recently, that statue was removed from the University of Cape Town, and a building that had been named after Cecil Rhodes was renamed to honor Sarah Baartman. But as activist, scholar, and artist Nomusa Makhubu explained to me when I asked her if the renaming of the building felt like a version of justice, "You can never say I've arrived because tomorrow some other right gets taken away: one step forward, two steps back. Justice is always a process."

---

# Shape

---

# BIGNESS



I've seen nearly every film and TV costume drama ever made about the nineteenth century: the ones about Queen Victoria, the ones where quirky small-town characters contend with the arrival of the railroad, the various Dickens and Eliot adaptations, all the versions of *Little Women*. My encyclopedic knowledge of period movies and shows has not only acquainted me with most of the BBC's character actors from the past fifty years but also provided an accidental fluency in the language of Victorian undergarments, those lacy, embellished bits of cotton and whalebone that so often serve as metaphors for what screenwriters imagine was happening to women in the nineteenth century. There are crinolines and petticoats, enormous and heavy, holding women down. There are plots that focus on the arrival of bloomers and the individuation of the lower limbs, suggesting freedom and rebellion. And then there are corsets, confining and controlling. You know a woman is finding liberation, or embracing her sexuality, when she loosens her corset's laces. But there is one Victorian undergarment I've never seen deliver a star turn: the bustle. The bustle—essentially a false butt designed to make a woman's backside look enormous using an accordion-like cage or puffy pillow tied to the waist—came to define the female silhouette of the late nineteenth century. The effect was that the bustled woman resembled a flouncy, adorned sofa. And although all parts of her actual anatomy were hidden, she actually looked like a person with a big butt.

When I conduct an internet image search of the contraption, the women who appear on my computer screen are clothed from chin to ankle in fringe and frills, buttoned up, and prudish. The outline of their bodies, however, is



undeniably (to me at least) in some kind of visual conversation with the widely seen cartoons of Sarah Baartman from 1810.

Although there are whispers of a link between Baartman and the bustle in the historical record, there are no think pieces from 1870 that outline a connection, no quotes from the designers who first sketched the bustle describing how they were influenced by Baartman's physique. But as I have learned from my work as a museum curator, objects and clothes from the past speak to us differently than words do. In order to understand the popularity of the bustle, it is necessary to understand the ways that unspoken, barely conscious notions of bodies, gender, and race become inscribed in even the most mundane parts of our lives.

Documents and words convey the reported version of history: they say, *Here is what happened—and here is what the people who recorded history thought about what happened*. But objects and clothes communicate from another part of the mind. Like a dream or a joke or a slip of the tongue, the ways we make, use, and save objects reveal feelings and beliefs that otherwise go unsaid. “The existence of a man-made object is concrete evidence of the presence of human intelligence operating at the time of fabrication,” says art historian and object expert Jules Prown. “Artifacts, then, can yield evidence of the patterns of mind of the society that fabricated them.” In other words, someone intentionally made every object that exists, and even if the maker didn't realize what they were doing, they brought their culture, beliefs, and desires to the task.

---

I expected the archives of the Victoria & Albert Museum to be in the back rooms of the museum's red-bricked building in central London, where grand, arched doorways and vaulted, painted ceilings inspire a sense of reverence and awe. But once I arrived in the swampy summer London heat, I realized that the storage facilities for the V & A instead were housed in the posh western suburbs of the city, in a castle-sized building that was once the former headquarters of the Post Office Savings Bank. The V & A has one of the best garment collections in the world, and I'd come to look at their bustle collection to see if I could do what Jules Prown suggests is possible: peer into the unconscious of the past.

The receptionist at the front desk asked me to deposit my things in a small locker before directing me toward a long wooden bench. Other researchers—coiffed women in suit jackets—soon joined, waiting patiently for their turn to pass through the metal door that opened into vast reserves of bones and dolls and furniture, the overflow collection of the V & A, the British Museum, and London’s Science Museum. One by one we left with our designated archivists, our locker keys attached to our wrists with rubber cords, like women at a spa on the way to a massage.

My assigned archivist, Saranella, introduced herself, and together, we rode an elevator to an expansive, high-ceilinged room filled with white floor-to-ceiling racks containing hundreds of still lifes, portraits in gilded frames, and shelves of objects wrapped in white, acid-free paper. Rows of mannequins stood haphazardly, their heads shrouded in white netting, their bodies cloaked with Tyvek, a plasticky white cloth that was used to protect the clothing from light and humidity. They looked like medieval maidens, covered and faceless, billowy and beautiful. A photograph pinned to each revealed the dress or petticoat stored beneath the synthetic covering.

When we arrived at my designated viewing space, Saranella directed me to three large tables covered in white archival paper where the garments I’d asked to view were laid out. There were no mannequins, only disembodied cloth lying flat and lifeless on the table. The poufs sagged, the fringe sat still.

The first bustle I inspected was a patterned maroon cushion with multiple stuffed oval lobes of varying size. It tied at the waist with simple white tape, and the pillows cascaded behind to create the desired gluteal lump. The second had a vaguely steampunk, S-and-M vibe. Made of now-rusty steel bands fastened together, it once would have opened and closed at a hinge to create the illusion of an almost triangular rear end. The third was made of stiffened white fabric that laced on the underside to create a pouf. The tighter the wearer cinched the laces, the more pert the butt became.

I’d come to the archive armed with a working knowledge of the basics: the first bustles, or proto-bustles, were small pads of cotton that women strapped to the small of the back to prevent the fabric from clinging to the body. They came to prominence during the Regency era—the period immortalized by Jane

Austen—when dresses were relatively comfortable, Grecian-inspired shifts. Women wore only a few layers of petticoats, and most didn't even wear underwear, unless they were riding a horse. The bustle emerged as a way to keep fabric from getting stuck between the legs and creating what was, essentially, a wedgie.

The simplicity didn't last long—by the 1840s, women were wearing enormous bell-shaped skirts with an undergirding infrastructure of petticoats. Underneath a woman's taffeta dress, she would have worn layer upon layer of cotton skirts, heavy and hot, designed to puff out and show the luxurious, expansive fullness of her gown. Wearing lots of petticoats meant a woman could afford lots of petticoats—as is often the case in fashion, the skirts were a symbol of wealth. Eventually, women made the switch to crinolines—petticoats made of horsehair, whalebone, and, later, steel—which made clothing lighter and cooler, and allowed skirts to grow bigger. By the 1850s, skirts were so enormous that women often couldn't walk through doorways.

Enter the bustle. Popularized in 1868, it grew larger and more bulbous in the early 1880s. The simplest bustles were nothing more than pillows stuffed with cotton or horsehair buckled around the waist. Later, as materials advanced and manufacturers tried to find new ways to sell their product, bustles grew more complicated. Some utilized an accordion-style design that folded up beneath a woman as she sat down, others made use of a swollen mesh bolster or a complicated arrangement of springs. The undergarment transcended class—some women simply stuffed their dresses with newspapers (the *London Times* was said to be the best choice) or flounced their petticoats and pinned them up in the back, similar to the way many brides do today. Even little girls wore them.

The garments on the table in front of me at the V & A were examples of the bustle from different eras, and each seemed to present a different set of problems for the wearer. The pillowy one seemed like it might easily shift, its bulge drifting hipward to undermine the big-butted illusion. The bustle whose girth was created by stiffened fabric appeared delicate and easy to crush, and while the accordion bustle appeared sturdy, it threatened malfunction, leaving the wearer in the lurch if it refused to open or close.

In addition to the bustles themselves, I'd also asked to see an example of the dresses that a woman would have worn on top of them. The one that lay on the table before me was an expensive, bright purple creation, fussy and fancy, its skirt designed with ample room for a bustle. I found myself almost jealous—how often had I raged that no skirt or pair of pants in the world would accommodate a large butt? And yet, here were garments made entirely for that purpose, at least in a sense.

Eager to see how these objects might transform the shape of a body, I asked Saranella if it might be possible to put the bustles and dresses on a mannequin. Her eyes widened. "Oh no, oh no," she said. I realized she had misunderstood my question, thinking that I wanted to slip into one of the dresses myself—dresses that I had been forbidden to touch. The misunderstanding made me imagine my own body wrapped in one of the enormous dresses, a silk collar up to my chin and a silk hem down to my ankle, a cushiony protrusion tied to my rump. I thought of the hot, cumbersome material of all those skirts, the punitive straightness of a laced-up corset trapping my fleshy torso, the boning and caging and ties digging into my softest parts. I imagined having to reach down and pull on the accordion bustle to unfurl it when I stood up, grabbing at my butt as I rose up out of my chair. A woman must have been forever adjusting and poking around her backside, yanking at her bustle and doing battle with its various components. Even when she was seated, there'd be no rest in it.

Although the bustle is relatively under-studied by fashion historians compared to other nineteenth-century garments, there are various theories for why it became so popular. Some posit that it's nothing more than an extension of the corset, believing that women who wore them weren't interested in largeness, but rather smallness: a large bottom highlights a small middle, and it is of course a small middle that women most wanted. There is an assumption in this logic that women have always primarily wanted small waists, despite the fact that a small waist also can make a butt look bigger. Another theory suggests that we shouldn't think of the bustle as a butt enlarger so much as a streamlined crinoline—skirts had grown ridiculously large by 1870 and the bustle may have been a practical solution to a common problem: bunch all those skirts up in the back so a woman could successfully find her way through a door.

There are also materialist theories about the rise of the bustle. The first Industrial Revolution in the late eighteenth century had made fabric widely available, and by the 1870s and 1880s, the invention of the sewing machine made it much faster for women to make their own clothes, a development that greatly worried professional dressmakers. Not only could women sew dresses themselves, they also came to know just how much the materials cost, inviting them to wonder why they were paying vastly more than the cost of fabric to have a dress made. In a canny response, dressmakers decided to prove their worth, adding the complicated seams and flourishes that comprise a bustle. In that way, a bustle also became a sign of wealth. The more a lady resembled a sofa, the richer she appeared.

Another theory suggests that there is, in fact, no theory at all. “Everyone wants to know ‘why,’ but with fashion there is never a why,” one fashion historian told me. “An idea starts out small, and then becomes exaggerated until it becomes absurd, at which point it fades away to be replaced by the next fad.” The bell shape of a crinoline turns into the back fullness of a bustle turns into the tubular shapes of the 1920s. There are only so many shapes you can put on the human body, and when we collectively get sick of one, we move on to another.

To me, these popular explanations ignore the obvious: the bustle is, definitionally, about bigness. There must have been some appeal to the look on its own, separate from whatever effect it had on the appearance of the waist. Many people of the late nineteenth century must have liked seeing, and being, women adorned with large, enhanced backsides. To suggest that fashion is a cycle divorced from context is to suggest it exists outside of history. It is to suppose that somehow choosing what clothes you put on every day has nothing to do with the politics, science, or ideas about bodies that swirl around us all. How could fashion possibly be exempt?

The day after my trek to the bustle archives, I met Edwina Ehrman, a curator at the Victoria & Albert and an important fashion historian who has written extensively on the history of underwear. When I asked her for a theory of the bustle, Ehrman was eager to remind me of common misconceptions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, a time often thought of as excessively

modest, with rigid, closely policed rules about nudity and gender. She points out that many Victorians actually had a keen sense of each other's bodies. "They were living hugga-mugga with each other. They didn't have separate bathrooms," she said. There were no central sewage systems, most families didn't have private bedrooms, and women's underwear was typically crotchless, so the wearer could easily lift up her skirts to squat and pee. The truth of bodies was everywhere, a truth that so many of us now hide behind closed bedroom and bathroom doors.

Perhaps from living so close together, from having to hike up skirts to go to the bathroom, from witnessing others' bodies in all manner of undress, the Victorians knew all too intimately the functions and products of the butt and designed a garment that transformed it. "The bottom is associated with dirt, with feces, with excretion, associated with what in the past would have been called 'unnatural sex.' It's a complicated area," Ehrman explained. The bustle created what Ehrman calls a "mono-bum," a nonthreatening facsimile of a woman's backside that had no crack and idealized its shape and function, making it more erotic as it became sanitized—proudly conspicuous yet cleared of messy complications, and therefore more appealing.

Previously, during the Renaissance, underwear had been designed to provocatively intimate what was underneath, but during the Victorian era, the cage and corset themselves became the objects of desire, an exoskeleton built to supplant the body underneath. But if all that clothing takes the place of the woman, if her undergarments create a new layer of skin, then she is always simultaneously naked and clothed. Her body is both on top of and underneath the cages and cotton, and her body is on display. Or, at least, someone's body is on display.

---

"Bustles! What are bustles?" asks the cheeky anonymous writer of the *Irish Penny Journal* in late October 1840. "A bustle is an article used by the ladies to take from their form the character of the Venus of the Greeks, and impart to it that of the Venus of the Hottentots!"

I'd been looking for visual evidence of a link between Sarah Baartman and the bustle in the puffs and springs of the garments on display at the Victoria & Albert, but I was still on the hunt for a written connection when I found this article in an Irish periodical that was sold to the working classes.

When the article in the *Irish Penny Journal* appeared, it had been more than twenty years since the height of the Sarah Baartman craze, but there she was again in the pages of a newspaper, in the form of a joke. The article indicates an enduring popular awareness of Sarah Baartman. It also suggests a relationship between her body and the emerging fad of the bustle. But the connection, it turned out, had been made long before.

In 1814, when Baartman was still alive, a vaudevillian play called *The Hottentot Venus; or, The Hatred of Frenchwomen* was staged in Paris. The plot centers around a French nobleman, Adolphe, and his resolve to marry what he calls *une femme sauvage*. He would be content with an "Indian Squaw or a Hottentot girl," both of whom he is sure would please him in bed more than a refined Frenchwoman. Amelie, Adolphe's cousin, who has designs on marrying him, conspires to trick him by dressing up like a "Hottentot" woman, wearing a large padded bottom and imitating Khoe dances and songs. She performs for her cousin as though she is Sarah Baartman, applying a kind of modified, bodily blackface. The whole show is played for laughs, a satirical romp poking fun at the French aristocracy's persistent eroticization of the African female form. The large, Black butt initially elicits an animal desire, but the small, white butt is ultimately privileged and prized, even found to be more sexually appealing. By the end of the play, the ruse is discovered and all is put right—Adolphe no longer hates Frenchwomen, and he no longer desires the Black "Hottentot girl." The white woman triumphs over the Black woman as an object of desire, able to seduce her man with the help of a bustle and then cast it aside. Imperial and social order is restored.

In *The Hottentot Venus; or, The Hatred of Frenchwomen*, we see what may be the earliest suggestion of a link between the bustle and Sarah Baartman. The bustle is a prosthetic bottom, a cage that a woman can take on and off to transform from a "Venus of the Greeks" to a "Venus of the Hottentots." The connection is explicit, the goal clear: the white Frenchwoman can use the bustle

to play in the stereotypes of sexuality that have come to be associated with African women. She can seduce her man and then cast aside the bustle that helped her to get the job done. The bustle is a prop of whiteness and Blackness both: it allows the Frenchwoman to mimic a body that she sees as undeniably Black and then reaffirm her whiteness by taking off her costume. It is a story we will see again and again.

Despite these and other cultural references, many fashion historians position the bustle as nothing more than a fashion item, a way to create a holistic silhouette rather than to enhance a specific body part, questioning the validity of the theory that the bustle was in part inspired by Sarah Baartman's body. For one thing, the bustle rose to the height of its popularity almost fifty years after her death. Why would it take so long for the connection to be made? But it's also true that Baartman's body was exhibited at the Museum of Natural History in Paris for the entirety of the nineteenth century and at the Paris exhibition in 1889, and she was not the only Khoe woman who was exhibited as the "Venus Hottentot"—many others were granted this designation and displayed throughout the nineteenth century. The idea of the big-butt Black woman with a very specific silhouette was deeply woven through the science and popular culture of the nineteenth century. There is also a question of why a late-nineteenth-century woman would have wanted to look like Sarah Baartman, whose silhouette had been used as the quintessential example of African as subhuman, immortalized in a museum vitrine. Her body, and especially her bottom, were displayed as proof that people of her tribe were of a lower order of animal than other humans on Earth. If this is the case, then why would it be a body white women would want to emulate?

And yet, white culture and fashion have both proved relentlessly adept at cherry-picking throughout the centuries, finding a way to poach the parts of other people's culture, histories, and bodies that suit them and leave behind the rest. This, too, is a recurring theme in the story of the butt. White culture is happy to take on "everything but the burden," as cultural critic Greg Tate calls it in his book by the same name. Take what you want and forget the rest. Enjoy, and poke fun at, the eroticism ascribed to the Black female body and discard the trauma of being cataloged as subhuman.



In a 1991 interview with critic Lisa Jones about the connection between Sarah Baartman's body and the bustle, poet Elizabeth Alexander explained it this way: "That which you are obsessed with, that you are afraid of, that you have to destroy, is the thing that you want more than anything." The white woman who wears a bustle can almost forget, or maybe never even consider, the body that hers has come to resemble, whose nudity she simulates. She thinks of it as fashion, or maybe her husband likes it. But this is a specific visual echo that she can strap on and take off—a dangerous and seductive bottom that is safely hidden and revealed at once. A bottom that represents the very thing her husband, her country, and even she is obsessed with and afraid of, and, consequently, desires more than anything.

---

Although Saranella didn't let me see one of the bustles on a mannequin, I knew where I could find one. In the dimly lit vitrines of the fashion galleries at the V & A, headless mannequins stood robed in seventeenth-century courtly dress and twentieth-century Chanel suits. In the section labeled "Couture & Commerce 1870–1910," a mannequin wore a beige dress with brick-colored flowers and a full bustle. The poufs were fully poufed, and the mannequin's rear protruded, high and large. A mirror stood behind the mannequin, so the museumgoer could see her dress and bustle from every angle. It really did look like an upholstered sofa. And it really did resemble the silhouette of Sarah Baartman.

Perhaps more than any other type of material culture, the things we put on our body speak explicitly to how we want to represent ourselves, how we want to be seen and understood. But sometimes we don't know exactly what we are communicating with the clothes we wear. It was mostly men who designed the poofs and pads and cages that nineteenth-century women buckled to their waists. It was mostly women who made them: in the sweatshops on New York's Lower East Side, in the cotton mills of Manchester, in the struggling dress shops burdened by the invention of the sewing machine. Enslaved people in the American South picked the cotton that stuffed the padding, miners in

Pennsylvania chiseled out the iron that gave the steel bustle its shape. And women, lots of women, all kinds of women, wore them.

Those women might not have thought much about the meanings of their silhouette as they strolled down a London street in 1880, backside protruding, fringe swinging. But their bustles were communicating nonetheless, offering a message about modesty and control, and a visual joke about race, colonization, and the value that had been ascribed to the bodies of Black women. Sarah Baartman may have died a half century earlier, but the legacy of her life and death were being dragged ever forward. And although what constituted a fashionable silhouette—and a fashionable butt—would soon change dramatically, this unconscious commentary about femininity, whiteness, and control would long remain stitched into women's clothing.

# SMALLNESS



When Gordon Conway was living in Dallas during the first decade of the twentieth century, she was young, rich, popular, and chic. Her father, a lumber magnate, died in 1906 and left the twelve-year-old Gordon and her mother, Tommie, a fortune and a mansion, which was soon filled with wealthy and stylish men courting the elegant widow. Gordon loved to draw, paint, go to the movies, and dance. She and her mother were inseparable and at the center of Dallas's burgeoning sophisticated smart set. The pair wore flashy red dresses, owned innumerable pairs of shoes, smoked cigarettes, danced the one-step, and were regularly scolded by members of the religious, conservative community surrounding them. They were both, in their way, a new kind of woman, profoundly different from their bustled Victorian foremothers. They were unrestrained and sophisticated, fun-loving and fashionable.

But Gordon and Tommie Conway looked very different from one another. Tommie was a classic Belle Epoque beauty, a woman whose pretty, curvaceous body and soft face were perfectly suited for the time in which she lived. As the stiff, cagelike crust of the bustle and corset had loosened, the ideal feminine look at the turn of the twentieth century came to be marked by swooshy, soft lines. The look of the "Gibson girl"—named for well-known illustrator Charles Gibson, who drew them in popular magazines including *Harper's* and *Collier's*—was looser, permitted a greater freedom of movement than her Victorian counterpart's clothing, but still boasted plenty of curves. She had ample breasts, a full butt, and a large mop of hair piled into a loose chignon atop her head.

Gordon Conway, in contrast to her mother, was all angles. She was tall and thin, with a prominent chin, a wide smile, and a flash of red hair. Although she

had a strong sense of style and she did her best with what she had, her immutable traits—her height, her bone structure, her skinny, coltish body—weren't the ones that Gibson was immortalizing in the magazines. As a child and teenager, she would cut her own face out of the family scrapbooks—a gesture of angst, perhaps, over the contrast between her own looks and her mother's. She knew her body wasn't the kind that many considered fashionable, even if her lifestyle very much was.

In the single biography dedicated to Gordon Conway's life, there are many anecdotes about parties, clothing, and love affairs. While she was traveling in Europe with Tommie, World War I broke out—a fact that the fun-loving women primarily considered an inconvenience, the cause of a premature end to their grand tour of teas, tennis, and gazing upon the works of the old masters. Plus, Gordon found that her many international boyfriends had all suddenly become inconveniently indisposed. In 1914, the Conways left a belligerent Europe by steamship, forced to take a route back to America through the North Atlantic—the same route taken by the *Titanic*—in order to avoid an ocean full of U-boats. When they disembarked in New York, it was as if the war was an easily forgotten dream. The United States was still years away from entering the conflict, and so Gordon and Tommie filled their days with cocktails at the Ritz, dinners at the Marie Antoinette, and dancing until the early morning hours on the roof of the Amsterdam.

But Gordon Conway wasn't a flibbertigibbet—or she wasn't exclusively a flibbertigibbet. She was also hardworking, reliable, and ambitious, and had set serious professional goals for herself. Busy as she was with her robust social life, nineteen-year-old Gordon had come to New York not only to party and drink, but also to join the ranks of the great magazine illustrators whose work she admired in the pages of *Vanity Fair* and *Harper's*. Gordon didn't just want to follow fashion, she wanted to change the definition of what was fashionable.

Within a year of arriving in the city, Gordon found a mentor in the form of artist and illustrator Heyworth Campbell, Condé Nast's first art director and a leader in the era's shift to make illustration a legitimate, essential, and lucrative part of editorial and advertising. Conway loved to draw, and she was good at it. She wanted to create fashion illustrations that would sell, but she was also eager

to develop her own particular voice and style. Campbell encouraged her to do just that, helping her find work at defining publications like *Vogue*, *Harper's Bazaar*, and *Vanity Fair*, an unusual role for a woman at the time. Over the next fifteen years, Conway would create over 5,000 magazine drawings, mostly depicting young, fashionable women. She also designed graphics and costumes for 119 stage productions and 47 films. Gordon Conway's illustrations would become iconic, defining images of the era—the Gibson girls of their own age.

The look that evolved in Conway's work was daring and new, upending centuries of rules and preferences regarding fashion and femininity. The women in her drawings were buttless and lissome. Their bodies were often caught in gestures of action or repose—mid-dance step, or ready to serve a tennis ball, or slouched on a sofa or stool. But the bodies of Conway's women had no natural curves. Occasionally, she allowed a slight nip at the waist or a hint of a breast or butt—always pert and always tiny—but the women inhabiting her illustrations were, as a rule, lithe, thin, and white, much like the person who drew them. The choice to depict women's bodies this way was a bold one, and perhaps a way for Conway to reclaim the body that had caused her so much grief as a young woman by projecting it proudly into the world, literally drawing herself into the story of fashion.

But it wasn't just the bodies of the women in her illustrations that resembled Conway. They also dressed and behaved like her. They wore short dresses with drop waists and cloche hats, and bobbed their hair. They were out at night, dancing, listening to music, and blowing smoke rings. Gordon Conway's women weren't just society girls, they were flappers, an archetype in the process of being invented and codified in the 1910s by illustrators such as Conway and her colleague John Held Jr., fashion designers like Coco Chanel and Paul Poiret, and a new kind of urban, bourgeois young woman who spent her nights drinking gin rickeys at Harlem jazz clubs—or at least imagining herself doing so.

This burgeoning concept of what it looked like, even what it meant, to be an adult woman would result in a profound and lasting cultural shift, expressed perhaps most overtly through fashion. Once again, the curves (or lack thereof) on a woman's body were the screen on which definitions of femininity and sexuality were being projected; bodies had again taken on a potent metaphorical

meaning. The nineteenth century was an era intrigued by, even obsessed with, big butts—in the 1800s, curves and bigness were central to what it meant to be a fashionable, feminine woman. But the twentieth century would offer a radical change. In a matter of a few short years, it was no longer curvaceous women gracing the pages of fashion magazines. Starting in the 1910s, a new silhouette began to appear, a silhouette that would have incredible staying power for at least another century. The buttless woman—rail-thin and glamorous—took hold with remarkable ferocity and resiliency, and has never really let go. As one scholar put it, “When the flapper raised her skirts above the knee and rolled her hose below it, the naked flesh of the lower limbs of respectable women was revealed for the first time since the fall of Rome; the connection of the two events was not seen as coincidental.” Where once there had been curves, now there were angles; where once there had been bustles, now there was buttlessness; where once there had been domesticity and constraint, there was now nightlife and liberation. Or at least that’s the way the story of the buttless woman is usually told—straight lines became synonymous with modernity and freedom.

---

The word *flapper* has at least two potential origins. One story suggests it was coined in the 1890s, first employed as British slang for a very young sex worker who looked like, and indeed often was, an underage girl. Another claim is that the word originated in England as a way to describe an awkward girl in her early teenage years whose body had not yet matured. This “girl who flapped” was supposed to require a particular kind of dress, with straight lines that covered her gawky, flapping limbs. From the very beginning, the flapper was, by definition, young, boyish, and lacking the bodily or behavioral characteristics usually ascribed to the mature woman. She was a perpetual adolescent yet was somehow always sexualized, a fact that underscores ever-shifting interpretations of women’s bodies—in the nineteenth century, it was the curvaceous body that carried the implication of excess sexuality; in the early twentieth century, a body that was in many ways the opposite seemed to convey a similar meaning. The

characteristics associated with the flapper were radically different from those associated with proper Victorian womanhood, and their popularity in the 1910s and '20s was the result of complex societal shifts in work, education, and sex.

At the end of the nineteenth century, the United States was becoming increasingly urban, thanks to surging immigration from overseas and steady migration away from rural farms and towns. Between 1860 and 1920, the number of people living in American cities rose from 6.2 to 54.3 million. Many of those migrants were women, who moved from their family homes to make their own living. Once settled in Chicago, New York, or San Francisco, they found themselves going out on dates with young men, away from the watchful parental gaze. Suddenly, there was new opportunity for unchaperoned romance and sexual experimentation.

Around the same time, the Nineteenth Amendment—ratified in 1920—gave many women the right to vote in the United States, and the idea that women could have a say in the realms of politics, education, and cultural life was becoming more widely, if unevenly, accepted. Even the question of how much women could, and should, move their bodies was changing—after decades of anxiety about middle-class and wealthy women overexerting themselves, popular books like *The Power and Beauty of Superb Womanhood* suggested that women should pursue exercise and sports to an “almost equal degree with man.”

With these societal changes came a sartorial revolution. It began with Paul Poiret, a cranky and competitive designer trained at the renowned House of Worth—often considered the first couture house—where he had been assigned to create dresses for everyday use. By 1906, Poiret had opened his own house, churning out an entirely new kind of dress for women, one with a long, straight silhouette, a V-shaped neckline, and a bold, colorful palette. Most notably, he cast out Victorian underwear, making clear his particular disdain for the corset. “I waged war upon it,” he said. “It divided its wearer into two distinct masses: on one side there was the bust and bosom, on the other, the whole backward aspect, so that the lady looked as if she was hauling a trailer.” Due largely to Poiret’s forceful opposition, the bustle—and the silhouette that suggested a big butt—would more or less disappear from mainstream American fashion for a century.

Although Poiret's notions about the corset may have emerged, in part, because of the burgeoning urban culture of women working and dating, he didn't intend to liberate women: he also invented a garment known as a hobble skirt, which greatly restricted a woman's ability to move her legs, forcing her to take tiny steps as she walked, literally hobbling her. There was a bit of authoritarian sadism in Poiret's thinking about fashion. He saw himself as a sartorial innovator and believed the women of the world had to obey whatever he capriciously decided should come next in fashion. He believed it was he, as a leading representative of the idea of fashion itself, who was in control of women and how they looked, moved, and behaved. They may have been freed from the corset, but they now had Poiret to contend with.

It wasn't long before fashionable women had a new ruler: in 1910, Gabrielle "Coco" Chanel opened a millinery shop and, later, a boutique in Normandy that sold her signature style of clothing inspired by menswear—including pants, simple sweaters, and belted jackets. Gone completely were the puffed sleeves and ruffles of Victorian and Edwardian dress. Chanel's clothes were simple and modern and looked best on women who looked like her—skinny women who had few curves and barely any butt.

Chanel's designs grew and remained popular throughout the First World War in large part because they were so practical to wear while doing the sorts of jobs that women were asked to take on as men went off to battle. By the 1920s, Chanel employed three thousand people in her factories and stores, and her signature look—sometimes referred to as the "garçonne"—had found its way onto the bodies of women across Europe: hemlines rose, waists dropped, and corsets were abandoned. Whether nursing in a hospital or making bombs in a munitions factory, women embraced styles that allowed them a greater freedom of motion.

Of course, the young women who had left their farm towns to work in urban shops weren't wearing original Chanel garments, nor were the women who took on wartime factory work. They were wearing knockoffs. Ready-to-wear fashion was on the rise, and Chanel's dresses were far easier to replicate than Victorian garments, since they were based on simple patterns and made of cheap jersey. Catalogs from retailers like Sears, Roebuck brought these inexpensive fashions



beyond the cities, and soon the flapper look could be spotted on main streets across the United States.

But popularity did not mean widespread acceptance. In the 1925 article “Flapper Jane” in the *New Republic*, writer Bruce Bliven offered an anxious, disapproving description of the flapper figure. “She is, for one thing, a very pretty girl,” Bliven explains. “She is, frankly, heavily made up, not to imitate nature, but for an altogether artificial effect—pallor mortis, poisonously scarlet lips, richly ringed eyes—the latter looking not so much debauched (which is the intention) as diabetic.” He added that Flapper Jane was known for “not wearing much.” Her dress was “brief”: “It is cut low where it might be high, and vice versa.” Of course, Jane has a bob. She wears no corset, petticoat, brassiere, or stockings. She embodies what Bliven calls “the new nakedness.” Others would describe those who embraced flapper style as “rectangle women.” That is, the flapper had no waist, no hips, no breasts. Both the clothes and the body underneath were at their most attractive when they resisted the bodily signs of womanliness. These were the women Gordon Conway drew and the kind of woman Gordon Conway was. These were the girls who were kissing young men in speakeasies and who didn’t seem to care about housewifery, or modesty, or decorum.

---

Although the unconscious, metaphorical associations of the bustle had at first seemed mysterious to me, the meaning of the rail-thin, curveless flapper physique feels easy to parse, in part because we still live in a landscape defined by it. For more than a century, the fashionable woman’s body has been a slim body, a body enrobed in sleek, straight lines rather than grand, arching curves. There have of course been fleeting periods when a bit of a frill or va-va-voom has snuck into fashion, but never to a pre-twentieth-century degree. To be fashionable, to be beautiful—according to the standards of mass culture—is to be slim, sleek, and liberated, from marriage, from the rules of society, from the heaviness of the back of the body.

The look of the flapper is the look of a woman who, according to the usual narrative, has thrown off the shackles of Victorian mores and Victorian clothes. She is both unquestionably female and yet unconstrained by maternity or domesticity. She is also very much a woman in motion—it's no coincidence that the image of the flapper developed along with the popularization of motion pictures. All of a sudden, people could see style in action. Fashion historian Anne Hollander suggests that, prior to the invention of photography, the only way for a female body to take up visual space was through layers of fat and clothing. "But a body that is perceived to be about to move must apparently replace those layers with layers of possible space to move in," she says. "The thin female body, once considered visually meager and unsatisfying without the suggestive expansions of elaborate clothing, had become substantial, freighted with potential action."

But even if the typical story of the buttless, fashionable woman suggested liberation, there was, of course, quite a bit more going on. Valerie Steele, the director of the Museum at the Fashion Institute of Technology, argues that, throughout the 1920s, a complicated, paradoxical revolution transpired: women found themselves physically unbound from their corsets, but they began to experience a new kind of confinement: a pressure to reshape and distort their bodies, this time not from without, but from within. In order to achieve and maintain the new, fashionable silhouette, many women—those who didn't naturally look like Gordon Conway or Coco Chanel—had to diet or exercise. For Steele, there was, in fact, little freedom in the new look of the 1920s. Instead, it demanded masochistic self-control, or even self-harm.

Steele clearly has a point. After all, it was in the early decades of the twentieth century that plastic surgery was invented and popularized, offering a radical new option if a woman wanted a different silhouette and had money to burn. General anesthesia was rudimentary and still somewhat experimental; every surgery was dangerous. Yet, some women still elected to undergo a procedure, risking their lives in an effort to eliminate fat in the butt and hips and achieve a straight, slender shape.

In these same years, women's magazines began to endorse various, often dubious regimes in order to transform the body and accommodate the fashions

depicted in their pages. In a study from 1912, researchers questioned ninety-nine women about their perceptions of their body: none of them were their desired weight, and most thought that they were too fat. These women weren't worried about their health, but instead about the way they looked, and, as one of the participants in the study said, the cure for these worries was "martyrdom." Bathroom scales, invented in 1917, became a popular way to monitor weight. A group called the "Slim Club" suggested that hips should "slope" and be no larger than a woman's shoulders. There were buttermilk diets, toast-and-hot-water diets, peanut-and-lettuce diets. Women were advised to take up chewing gum, or to eat gumdrops containing laxatives, or to smoke cigarettes, heavily and frequently.

But the look of the flapper wasn't only about sleek buttlessness; it also incorporated elements of exoticism. Designers like Poiret drew heavily from what they perceived to be "Eastern" influences, a broad and vague category that encompassed every where from Russia and the Ottoman Empire to Japan, India, and China. The "East" was a vast category for these designers—a category defined as everything that was not "West." In creating his looks, Poiret drew from the costumes of the Ballets Russes—which were themselves stylized versions of Ottoman and Arabic designs—and also heavily referenced an imagined idea of Japan. This Japonisme was part of a much larger mania for all things Japanese that emerged in the mid-nineteenth century after Western governments formed trade and diplomatic relationships with Japan. Moneyed Europeans held Japanese-themed balls, both the London International Exhibition in 1862 and the Paris Exposition Universelle in 1867 prominently featured Japanese art, and there was even a replica of a Japanese village installed in a London park. Many European artists—including Whistler, Monet, Proust, and Oscar Wilde—took inspiration from this boom in Japanese cultural products in both subject matter and technique, helping to create a Western aesthetic heavily influenced by Japanese style, one that helped usher Japanese aesthetics into the domains of high art and refined taste.

The Japonisme phenomenon ballooned further in the early twentieth century with the work of Poiret and, to some extent, Chanel. Both designers not only borrowed Japanese fabrics and patterns but were influenced by the way

cloth was utilized in some traditional Asian garments. Rather than building on the highly tailored and embellished forms of dress that had been popular in the West since the Middle Ages, Poiret and Chanel took inspiration from the way that Indian saris and Japanese kimonos emphasized the “flat terrain of the cloth.” In 1912, for example, Poiret offered an evening coat that directly referenced Japanese kimonos—a long, T-shaped garment that wrapped around the wearer and had large, open sleeves. It had no waist or even a tie (unlike a kimono, which ties with a sash called an obi), which meant that the garment hung on the wearer in long, unbending lines. When customers purchased and wore these garments, part of what they were signaling was a commitment to what Japanese aesthetics has come to represent—high culture, good taste, and modernity.

But there was another subtext to the adoption of Asian motifs in the fashions of the 1920s, particularly in the United States. By the turn of the twentieth century, East Asian women had been popularly construed as highly sexual, thanks, in part, to the Page Act of 1875, which had effectively prohibited the immigration of East Asian (and primarily Chinese) women to the United States because they were assumed to be sex workers. This association meant that by the 1920s, garments like Poiret’s coat—inspired by those traditionally worn by East Asian women—carried with them such connotations of Asian femininity: another example of racialized hypersexuality conflated with signifiers of sophistication and taste.

As with almost all American cultural phenomena, the flapper was also formed by her relationship to (and distance from) Blackness. Although the archetypal flapper—the kind depicted in Conway’s illustrations—was a white woman, arguably one of the most famous flappers was Josephine Baker, a Black woman who possessed what was almost certainly the most famous butt of the 1920s. Born in 1906 in St. Louis, Baker was, by age fifteen, working as a vaudeville dancer in New York City. By nineteen she had left New York for Paris, where she later said she went “to find freedom.”

In the midtwenties, Paris was a hub for Black American artists and intellectuals, many of whom understood the city as a place where they could meet and live among Black people from around the world and enjoy a level of

tolerance and respect that was unavailable to them in the United States. World War I had brought 200,000 Black American soldiers to Europe to serve in segregated forces, as well as 500,000 French forces conscripted from the colonies, many from African countries including Senegal and the Sudan. These groups encountered each other during the war and after, fostering a sense of Paris as a place of Pan-African intermingling and cosmopolitanism. Nearly every major Harlem Renaissance figure—including Langston Hughes, Claude McKay, Jean Toomer, Sidney Bechet, Ada “Bricktop” Smith, Archibald Motley, and Nella Larsen—spent time in Paris in the 1920s, part of the reason the city would become a center for the Négritude movement in the 1930s.

But, of course, France was hardly free of racism. As many have pointed out, the paradox baked into the kind of “freedom” that Josephine Baker enjoyed was that it took place in the capital city of an empire that was actively subjugating millions of Black Africans. It was also a place where white intellectuals and artists were enthralled by what they called the “primitivism” of African art and culture and an exoticized conception of Black people. This interest in Blackness was common in white bohemian and flapper circles in the United States as well; in New York City, flappers like Conway regularly went to Harlem nightclubs—a way of engaging with Black culture and rebelling through racial mixing.

It was in the Paris of Harlem Renaissance expats and modernist fantasies of primitivism that Josephine Baker’s most famous performance, *La Revue Nègre*, opened to titillated crowds and massive popularity. No film footage survives of *La Revue Nègre*; we have only contemporaneous accounts of the performance to indicate what it was that intoxicated so many spectators in 1925. The performance, organized by a French music hall director to exhibit different modes of “African-ness,” consisted of four acts. Although Baker appeared in the first act, it was when and how she emerged in the fourth that caused a sensation. Some said she came onstage completely nude (although she may have been dressed as if to appear nude), wearing only a pink flamingo feather. She was carried onto the stage on the back of her Black male dance partner and then slid down his body, or perhaps cartwheeled off of it, to present herself to the audience. Then, Baker danced. According to her memoir, everyone near the stage during rehearsals was enraptured: stagehands stared, the theater’s typists

peeped at her through a hole in the wall of the set, and the twenty people seated in the orchestra began spontaneously shaking their legs, electrified and transfixed by her movements. She danced the Charleston, a Black American vernacular dance that had originated in South Carolina. Baker described the dance, which was new to Paris, as “dancing with the hips, one on top of the other; one foot on top of the other; and getting your butt out and shaking your hands.” In one account of the first performance, a man cried out, “What an ass!” Others were horrified. In his biography of his mother, Baker’s adopted son Jean-Claude Baker described what he had heard about the moments immediately following the dance: “Some people in the audience scream for more, others rise, wrapping themselves in indignation and little furs, and stalk from the theater, muttering that jazz and blacks are going to destroy white civilization.” Jean-Claude Baker described the chorus girls—young Black girls like Baker—as horrified for other reasons: “She had no self-respect, no shame in front of these crackers,” a chorus girl named Lydia Jones told him. “And would you believe it, they loved her.”

Critics went wild for the performance. But in their fervor, they trafficked in the racist stereotypes that had been applied for centuries when it came to Black women and butts. In *L’Art Vivant*, for example, André Levinson said that Baker had “the splendor of an ancient animal, until the movements of her behind and her grin of a benevolent cannibal make admiring spectators laugh.” In her memoir, Baker explained why she thought her performance became a sensation. “We’ve been hiding our butts too much for a while now. It does exist, the butt. I don’t know why we have to criticize it. It’s true that there are butts that are so stupid, so pretentious, so insignificant, that they [are] only good to sit on.”

“Like Stravinsky’s *The Rite of Spring*,” is how dance scholar Brenda Dixon Gottschild describes the first performance of *La Revue Nègre* in the documentary *Josephine Baker: The First Black Superstar*. “It just set some people crazy. Some people thought it was the end of European civilization as they knew it. And the battlefield was Josephine Baker’s bum.” The performance created what the French called “Bakermanie,” or Baker-mania: in the wake of *La Revue Nègre*, Baker became one of the most famous, and wealthy, women in France. Her image was used in advertising campaigns for cigarettes and hair pomade,

and she became a muse to illustrators and photographers. There was even a Josephine Baker doll available for purchase.

*La Revue Nègre* was a bold statement, drawing from the long history of both Black American vernacular dance and the minstrel and vaudeville theater in which Baker had performed in the United States. It contained elements of the shimmy and the shake, and challenged traditional Western European ideas of dance. “All of these moves that in the European mode would have been considered awkward become beautiful, sexy, silly, and savvy at the same time,” explains Dixon Gottschild. Later, as the performance evolved, Baker incorporated her famous banana skirt and, eventually, a pet cheetah who regularly made his way into the orchestra pit—elements that played into the idea of Baker as an exotic creature and added notes of vaudeville humor.

Baker’s performances were complex, as are their legacy. Some have characterized her as a twentieth-century Sarah Baartman, another Black woman put on display for the titillation of fascinated, scandalized bourgeois white spectators. But she is often also criticized for exoticizing herself, knowingly participating in her own exploitation, playing into African stereotypes with her nudity, the banana skirt, and the cheetah. Others interpret *La Revue Nègre* as a means of reclaiming those stereotypes: Baker enthusiastically, and freely, participated in the performances and made lots of money doing it, and she surely understood that she was engaging with, and even subverting, stereotypes of Black femininity. She was also funny, and her performances always contained elements of humor and parody. From her early days as a chorus girl, she would add an element of knowingness by feigning being a bad dancer onstage for a laugh. She may have been sexualized and objectified by her largely white audience in Paris, but she also maintained significant control over what she was doing.

And so although the flapper was, in part, the buttless fantasy of Coco Chanel, and although many women in the 1920s used diets, exercise, and surgical procedures to minimize any hint of a curve, they were also sticking their butts out like Josephine Baker and dancing the Charleston. Some of those women may have had butts that were, as Baker put it, “so stupid, so pretentious, so insignificant” that they were only good to sit on—a barely veiled dig against

white people's discomfort around butts—but many of them were trying out, and trying on, the sexualized freedom that they imagined into the body of Josephine Baker and other women of color presumed to be more inherently sexual than white women. It was a relationship between Black and white femininity that was old, and one that would prove to endure.

The creation of a silhouette—whether the bulbousness of the bustle or the straight lines of the flapper—is both an aesthetic and a political gesture. As garments are designed and trends emerge, the curves of a woman's body—whether created by clothes, genetics, diet, or exercise—are transformed into metaphors that come to stand in for larger stories about gender, taste, and class. And although those meanings almost always remain unspoken, and even unconscious, like the butt itself, they exist nonetheless, made all the more powerful for remaining unuttered.



---

Norma

---

# CREATION



The first dressing room I remember was at Hudson's, a Detroit-based department store where middle-class people in the town where I grew up went to get things that were "nice." It was the place where my mother bought me overalls and hair bows, where she bought herself high-heeled shoes displayed like pastries on wooden pedestals, and where we picked out cloth napkins for relatives who were getting married.

On those shopping trips, my mother would gather a pile of clothes, hunting and pecking her way through the various women's departments. We both loved this part. For me, the initial search on a shopping trip is when optimism is at its peak, the time when all the garments on offer might actually fit, when they still might actually look good. It is during the second act of the shopping experience when it all goes awry.

Despite its being a "nice" store, the dressing rooms at Hudson's were, in my mother's parlance, "jenky." The worn carpet was dirty; the dividers that created the stalls, flimsy; the ceilings, oppressively low. The lighting wasn't just unflattering but outright cruel. As a little girl, I sat without thought on the floor, exhausted in the same way I feel now after a trip to an art museum—overwhelmed by sense, but also overwhelmed, I realize now, by the store's manifestation of femininity: the puffs of perfume, the textures of raw silk and combed cotton, the fantasies that all that adult femaleness unleashed inside me. Sometimes I curled up on the stained brown carpet and just fell asleep.

Meanwhile my mother, always so neat and thoughtful, hung up her garments before changing out of her own clothes. She had once worked in a Hudson's, and so was aware of all the perpetual folding and steaming that the saleswomen

had to do. She unfurled each pair of new pants, stepped inside them, and examined herself in the mirrors.

This was the part that was hard.

My mom rarely liked clothes once she wore them. The promise she'd seen in each garment on its hanger was dashed once she had buttoned and zipped it onto her body. The hem was revealed to be too long, the waist too wide; the material hugged her too tight. But her language, my language, our language, for what was wrong was never about the clothes, but instead was about ourselves. *I'm too short*, she'd say, or *My arms are too flabby*. And always, always: *My butt is too big*. In other words, *The clothes are not flawed. I am*.

It was something I soon came to understand and practice myself. Trying on clothes often feels like trying to jam your body into a template of someone else's—and most of the time, that is exactly what's happening. Bodies are bespoke, and most clothes made since the 1920s are mass-produced industrial products: when the pants don't fit, it's because the proportions of a body don't match up to the proportions that the clothing companies imagined for it.

In addition to all the other tacit work the fashion industry does to define what different body types mean, clothing offers a frank materialization of rightness. Pants are a physical object you can hold in your hands, reminding you that there are parts of your body that literally do not fit. For everything that reveals itself to be too big, or too small, there is the clear indication that somewhere there is a thing that is just right, a body that is in the middle, a body that is correct.

This middle thing is somehow both an ideal and an average, made perfect by not being too much of anything. But what is this middle thing, this normal thing? My mother always said her butt was too big. I often say the same thing. But “too big” compared to what?

---

Norma's butt is twenty-nine inches across, from hip bone to hip bone. It's round and pert and, because it's made of stone, alarmingly smooth. It is substantial, a handful, but no one would call it big. If it were made of flesh, it

would fill out a swimsuit nicely, but I doubt it would elicit a long second look. Norma has the Goldilocks butt, the Goldilocks body. Everything about her, at least according to the people who designed her, is “just right.”

In June 1945, Norma made her first appearance, at an exhibition hall at the American Museum of Natural History in New York. On the other end of the hall stood her male counterpart, Normman. The pair were representations of the “typical” reproductive human adult male and female, and were created by gynecologist Robert Latou Dickinson and artist Abram Belskie, who had previously collaborated on a series of sculptures for the 1939 New York World’s Fair called *Birthing Series*, which displayed cross-sections of normal human development in utero.

If *Birthing Series* showed viewers what happened as a healthy fetus developed, Norma was the example of the body that could, and, according to her makers, should carry that fetus through a pregnancy. She was not voluptuous and she was not skinny. She was strong, robust, and capable of bearing many children—not too sexy, but clearly fertile. She wasn’t one of Gordon Conway’s flappers, nor was she a Gibson girl with soft, fleshy curves. She had slender, but present, hips. Her breasts seemed to be something of an afterthought, designed by a person who seemed to have never seen breasts in real life: two perky orbs that floated awkwardly on her chest. As her name suggests, Norma was not, in any real way, exceptional. She was *normal*.

But just what did that mean? The statue suggests a very specific concept of normal: she was white, heterosexual (Normman steadfastly stood by her at all times in the exhibition hall to reassure us of that), and able-bodied. She was a little dour, offering none of the seduction of classic statuary, and stood perfectly erect, arms by her sides, posed as if in a scientific drawing. She was appealing (as her name suggests) in her normal-ness—and that was the intent.

Norma and Normman were a project of American eugenics, the racial science invented by Francis Galton that had built on the work of Georges Cuvier and other nineteenth-century thinkers to create and enforce a hierarchy of human bodies. While one strain of eugenicists in the United States was working hard to eliminate the unfit through sterilization, others were busy encouraging the “right” people to have children. Those involved in this branch of eugenics—

called positive eugenics—tried to make it as clear as possible which Americans they thought should be procreating. One popular strategy of positive eugenics was to host “better baby” competitions that awarded prizes to the most “eugenic” babies at state fairs across the Midwest—a vague distinction that encompassed health, robustness, and comportment with the eugenics ideas of human fitness. This was a way to show farmers—people eugenicists thought would understand the importance of making thoughtful breeding decisions—how to choose good mates. The contests were like a 4-H competition with children instead of pigs. The babies that eugenicists deemed the fittest were given a prize.

Norma and Normman were a kind of grown-up version of a better baby contest. They offered physical manifestations of what eugenicists thought the people of America should aspire to be. Standing in the halls of the most famous natural history museum in America, Norma and Normman exemplified to visitors what kinds of adult bodies, and people, were “fit.” They were robust, fertile, able-bodied, and native-born white. The museum displayed them as singular objects, creations meant to codify the aesthetics of normality in the immediate aftermath of World War II, when normal was what many people very much aspired to be.

In the interests of maintaining a “scientific” approach, Belskie and Dickinson relied on data in the creation of Norma and Normman, rather than subjective preference. The specifications for Normman’s creation had been easy enough to come by: during World War I, the military had measured every drafted US serviceman. There also was data from men who had volunteered to be measured at the Chicago World’s Fair, as well as statistics from the early years of the Ivy League posture studies and insurance company physicals. They just had to be added up, divided, and *voilà!* The average American man.

Norma’s creation, however, proved to be more difficult. Women didn’t serve in the military at the time, and, at first, there seemed to be no large repository of measurements of the female population. But Belskie and Dickinson were living in an age of metrics, a time when it seemed that all things could and must be measured, managed, and known. Surely the female body was of interest to researchers somewhere.

In 1945, they finally found the data set they were looking for. Five years earlier, a group of researchers had measured thousands of American women at the USDA's Bureau of Home Economics, one of the only places where female scientists and statisticians could find a home in the first half of the twentieth century. The effort had been led by a chemist named Ruth O'Brien, who worked to find a way to create standard sizes for ready-made clothes. "There are no standards for garment sizes," O'Brien offered by way of explanation for her efforts, "and retailers and consumers are subjected to unnecessary expense and harassed by the difficulties involved in obtaining properly fitting clothing."

The study, funded by the Works Progress Administration and lasting for one year, sought to discover the girths, lengths, and heights of the American woman in all her difference. To do so, O'Brien sent government-employed measurers to Illinois, Maryland, Arkansas, New Jersey, North Carolina, and California. In municipalities across the country, "measuring squads," as she called them, recruited volunteers from local women's clubs. Each was asked to wear cotton measuring shorts and a not-too-tight-fitting bandeau bra and was invited to step onto a measuring platform, where they were weighed using a government-issued scale. Then, the measurer took fifty-eight additional measurements, including "sitting spread girth," "anterior crotch length," and "maximum thigh girth." The squads brought in fifteen thousand surveys, but O'Brien ultimately only used ten thousand. O'Brien discarded the other five thousand for one of three reasons: there had been a gross error, there were too many young people in the data set, or the volunteers weren't white. The truth was, O'Brien wasn't interested in data for all American women; she wanted data from all American-born white women. It was a criterion that she explicitly stated in her report but never fully explained—in fact, she encouraged the measuring squads to keep it hidden from groups of volunteers. "When it was found necessary, for the sake of good feelings within a group, to measure a few women other than the Caucasian race, this fact was entered under the remarks and the schedule later discarded," she wrote.

For the eugenicists constructing Norma, these exclusions were a feature, not a bug. After all, Norma was intended to be a composite of the *right kind* of American woman: a statue that defined femininity and made clear who should

be reproducing and who should not. Harry L. Shapiro, the proud eugenicist and curator of physical anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History, was thrilled by the result. In his article about Norma and Normman, “A Portrait of the American People,” which ran in the museum’s magazine in 1945, he praised the statues for helping to codify the “White American”—a category of person he feared was in danger of being sullied and diminished through racial mixing. With delight, he explained how aesthetically impressive and well proportioned the White American was, how tall and long legged. The full text reads like an anthropological dating advertisement, as Norma and Normman are compared to people of other nationalities and from various historical periods: Shapiro declares them healthier, fitter, taller, less voluptuous, and more beautiful than the ancient Greeks, the Gibson girl, or the European.

Shapiro, who would go on to be the president of the American Eugenics Society, also emphasized how the average could be an ideal. “Norma and Normman, although they were designed to conform with the average adult before the onset of the ravages of age, exhibit a harmony of proportion that seems far indeed from the usual or the average.” Their averageness was notable and, paradoxically, unique. Shapiro said, “Let us state it this way: the average American figure approaches a kind of perfection of bodily form and proportion; the average is excessively rare.”

When I first read Shapiro’s conflation of the word *normal* with *perfection*, I found it to be a bit of a stretch. Perfection, after all, suggests an apex rather than a middle, a singular kind of human who is, in some sense, above all others. The way I’d always understood it, a perfect human woman would be smarter, more beautiful, thinner, and more graceful than the rest. She’d be special, not typical.

And yet, Shapiro’s formulation does make intuitive, if not actual, sense. I had often found my own body to be, in some small sense, *abnormal*. My large butt, my slightly crossed eye, and my poor performance in any and all sports always felt like defects when, in fact, they were characteristics of mine that were surely quite common. And yet, those characteristics never felt normal, because the notion of normal is not about averages or commonly occurring traits, but instead about an unattainable ideal.

Norma and Normman were on display at the American Museum of Natural History in New York for only a few weeks before traveling to the heartland. The director of the Cleveland Museum of Health, a man named Bruno Gebhard, purchased them, as well as *Birth Series*, to display in the first health museum in the United States. There, they became a sensation.

Like Shapiro, Gebhard was a committed eugenicist: he had been the curator at the Deutsches Hygiene-Museum in Dresden from 1927 to 1935, overseeing exhibitions about the human body with an explicit eugenicist agenda. In the United States, he continued this work, albeit with a bit more subtlety. Norma and Normman were a prime example.

Once she arrived in Cleveland, Gebhard didn't want to celebrate Norma as fantasy; he wanted to find a version of her walking around in the world. He wanted to prove that his idea of normal could actually be a reality. If the "normal body" was something that seemed entirely out of reach, like a Venus or a fashion model, it wouldn't have served the ends of men like Gebhard and Shapiro, who aspired to bring about a world populated exclusively by Normas and Normmans. In order to attain their goal, eugenicists needed those they considered to be fit Americans to know that they, too, could be "normal." So, two months after the statues arrived in Cleveland, Gebhard announced a competition in collaboration with the Cleveland *Plain Dealer* to find a real-life Norma. It was a way to show the people of Cleveland who among them was the pinnacle of human perfection, and get some extra publicity for the museum's newest acquisitions.

For ten days in September 1945, the *Plain Dealer's* health reporter, Josephine Robertson, churned out pages of Norma-focused content that encouraged female readers, explicitly and implicitly, to enter the contest, which, according to promotional materials, sought to "stimulate interest in physical fitness and the American type." She interviewed clergy, doctors, and educators about the "typical American girl," talked to artists about Norma's aesthetic qualities, and even asked physical fitness instructors how to achieve the Norma physique. The articles were a little bit corny but expressed the same sort of ideas that remain common in fashion magazines and lifestyle sections today: they were written to help to define normal, to explain why normal was beautiful, and to



make clear who belonged inside the category of normal—the white, physically fit, able-bodied woman of specific proportion—and who did not.

The contest, like the fabrication of the statues themselves, happened at an opportune time: it had only been a month since the United States had dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and two weeks since Japan had officially surrendered. After four years of women taking on traditional male roles in factories and homes, there was a pressing need to clearly communicate the idea of the “normal woman” and to make that idea broadly legible. Normal was femme, but not too femme; normal was strong, but not too strong; normal meant having a butt, but only a little one. Normal meant leaving the factory behind, getting married to a GI, and joining in the effort to repopulate a world that had just lost millions.

All told, 3,864 women in the Cleveland area submitted their measurements to Gebhard and the *Plain Dealer*. The form published by the newspaper was simpler than those used by O’Brien’s measuring squads, asking only for height, bust, waist, hips, thigh, calf, ankle, foot length, and weight measurements. Some women measured themselves at home, while others attended events around the city where it would be done for them. On the last day of the contest alone, approximately one thousand women were measured at the Cleveland Central YWCA.

The following day, the forty entrants whose proportions came closest to Norma’s gathered at the YWCA for the final stage of competition. Like the contest itself, the scene was a little bit Miss America and a little bit science lab. The finalists were officially measured and judged by a panel that included a professor of anatomy at a local university, the head of physical education for girls at the Cleveland Board of Education, and another reporter at the *Plain Dealer*. Then, the panelists tabulated the measurements and tried to determine a winner. What they discovered should have been predictable all along: none of the contestants was a match for Norma. As Shapiro had said, the average is excessively rare.

The woman who came the closest was Martha Skidmore, a white twenty-three-year-old who sold tickets at the local Park Theater. In an article, Josephine Robertson described her as an almost cartoonish ideal of post–World War II

femininity. When the war began, Skidmore had worked as a gauge grinder for the Parker Appliance Co., but by the time of publication, she had returned to her old job in order to make her position at the factory available for a returning vet. She was already married and was referred to as “Mrs. Skidmore” throughout the piece. She liked to swim, dance, and bowl, and thought “she was an average individual in her tastes and that nothing out of the ordinary had ever happened to her until the Norma search came along.”

---

The idea of normal, it seems, always comes with some kind of agenda. In the case of Norma, the minds that collated her measurements were enthusiastic eugenicists, motivated by a desire to effectively eradicate insufficiently white, disabled, and queer people. They were openly attempting to engineer a race of perfectly normal Americans, equating full citizenship with having this decisively average, yet demonstrably unattainable, body. By codifying normal, the Norma boosters were also codifying abnormal, which is always the implicit project of the creation of an ideal.

But if the creation of Norma proves anything, it's that no body actually *is* normal. Despite all her rigorous measuring, Ruth O'Brien's study failed—even after measuring thousands of women and crunching and tabulating all the data, there were too many variables for her to create a meaningful set of recommendations for ready-to-wear clothes. Both Gebhard and O'Brien failed to find the superlative normal that they both craved, because creating something singular inevitably separates it from the group. Their projects couldn't work because bodies aren't standard. Some breasts bulge and some sag, some ankles are thick while others are thin, some people with wide shoulders have narrow hips. And some butts are big, while others are small.

Just as the exploitation and display of Sarah Baartman might feel like a relic of the distant past, it is tempting to think that we have outgrown Norma, that we have transcended the pernicious fantasy of an empirical and enforceable “normal.” But the truth is that while the material of normalcy is a moving target, the concept of “the normal” is extraordinarily durable, even if there are no

curators and sculptors openly regulating it. It may not be staring us down in a museum of hygiene, but it is always lurking—in dressing rooms, in magazines, in the endless scroll of Instagram.

# PROLIFERATION



**F**or all its power and staggering profits, the vast ready-to-wear fashion industry is a relatively new system, and the attempt to create standardized sizes is newer still. Until the nineteenth century, almost all clothing was made the way couture clothing is made now—individually, by hand, for a specific person. Before 1300, most clothing in Europe was not formfitting but loose and flowy, which allowed for sizing to be general and generous. A medieval belted tunic was easy to make fit, and most people only had one or two such garments for their entire adult lives. This relative sizelessness existed because the process of making clothing was arduous: not only did a person have to sew each garment by hand with a needle and thread, they also had to spin wool or other fibers in order to create the cloth for the garment. Each article of clothing had to be worn for many years and accommodate changes in height and girth.

In the late eighteenth century, the first Industrial Revolution simplified textile manufacturing and advanced weaving technology, which meant a great many more people could buy ready-made cloth, a truly monumental shift. The process of making clothing grew simpler and cheaper for the home tailor because a large part of the work was outsourced to low-wage laborers in textile mills. Wealthy women hired well-paid dressmakers to make adorned and elaborate garments, while low-paid seamstresses who worked out of their homes sewed precut garments into clothes for enslaved people in the South, miners in the West, and even New England gentlemen. In the 1850s, the invention of the mass-produced sewing machine further upended garment making: clothing became even cheaper, and more clothes than ever were being produced,

although the wages of the seamstresses in home sweatshops did not markedly improve.

Like so many other technologies, the first standard garment sizes were developed by the military. Napoleon, ever the innovator, needed to fit thousands of men with uniforms and could not possibly fabricate each one individually. It was a problem that would also confront the British during the Crimean War and the Americans during the Civil War, and one they would all solve in more or less the same way. Military officials discovered that you could get a general sense of a man's proportions if you measured his chest, and so created a set of standard sizes extrapolated from that single measurement.

During peacetime in the nineteenth century, the military sizing system was utilized to make men's clothing for the burgeoning white-collar workers who required suits for everyday wear. The approach wasn't perfect, but it worked well enough, in part because men's bodies are less fleshy than women's, and the distribution of that flesh is more uniform (they are also spared the unpredictable bulbousness of breasts, fleshy butts, and pregnancy). Men's clothing became big business: by the 1890s, the garment district in New York was the single largest employer in the city. But, as would always be true in the garment industry, big profits did not mean fair wages. From the beginning of the nineteenth century, the people who actually made the garments were largely immigrants—first from Ireland, then Germany and Sweden, and, by the 1890s, Southern and Eastern Europe—and their working conditions and pay were almost universally abysmal.

For much of the same period, the garment industry did not offer a comparable sizing system for women, despite the success and popularity of male ready-to-wear fashions (that is, clothing that could be bought in a shop and worn without alteration). That wasn't, however, for a lack of trying. Manufacturers knew there was a tremendous amount of money to be made if women could buy clothes off the rack; they just struggled to figure out how to make it work. The first attempts were half-measures: by the 1890s, women could purchase garments that were three-quarters of the way finished at a shop or in a catalog, which they could alter and fit to their bodies using their sewing machines, completing the last step of labor at home.

Then, in the early twentieth century, around the same time that Coco Chanel was busy pioneering simpler and more sporty styles, manufacturers started to produce fully finished clothing for women. At first, they tried to model their approach to women's sizes off of men's sizes, using a bust measurement as the basis of a woman's entire body size. This, obviously, did not work well. Breast size is in no way indicative of any other measurement on a woman's body: a woman with large hips can have small breasts; a woman with long legs can have big breasts. Soon, women who had ordered clothes through catalogs (a common practice at the time) were sending back their purchases in droves.

Following Ruth O'Brien's 1930s study, the fashion industry attempted to put her data into practice, but her system was impossible for manufacturers to use. Every size cost a tremendous amount to make because manufacturers had to create new dies to cut each size, and O'Brien's system suggested the need for twenty-seven sizes, a prohibitively expensive number. Then, in 1958, the National Bureau of Standards, a part of the federal government, reworked Ruth O'Brien's data and, combining it with sizing's relentless dedication to chest measurements, came up with a system similar to the one we use today. The numbers were derived from bust size and the assumed proportions of an hourglass figure, and each size was indicated by a single number, in even intervals from 8 to 38. At first mandatory, this system became voluntary in 1970, and was ultimately abandoned entirely in 1983, largely because it never really worked.

"Unless your clothes are made for you, they don't actually fit you," Abigail Glaum-Lathbury tells me in one of our many conversations about clothing size. An artist, fashion designer, and professor at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, Glaum-Lathbury has done a tremendous amount of research into the history of sizing and how it works now. She explains that today, women's clothing sizes offer almost no information about how a garment actually fits. I've talked to Glaum-Lathbury several times, in part because I find this fact baffling but also intriguing. Although I've never purchased something that feels right on my body, it's a revelation to learn that clothing designers and manufacturers don't actually expect their garments to fit. It isn't that they don't want to make clothes that fit a variety of bodies, it's just that, even with advanced technology and manufacturing, it is simply impossible.

Fit, after all, is determined by the distribution of flesh around a body, Glaum-Lathbury explains, and flesh cannot be standardized. Even if two women have the exact same height and circumference measurements, they don't necessarily share the same flesh distribution over their bones. There is nowhere you see this more, she says, than with breasts. Even if she and I had the exact same measurements, our breasts might differ. "I might have a wider rib cage than you," she told me, "or you might have a broader shoulder than me, or my breasts might go further out to the side and yours might be bigger and go forward." The same could be said about butts—hip and waist measurements don't speak to the distribution or shape of a woman's backside. There's no uniformity in the panoply of butts, so uniform pants sizes are completely unrealistic.

When designers create clothing, they usually start by fitting the clothes on mannequins—hard, fleshless, headless torsos and legs that approximate a body. Although they are practical for an early prototype, mannequins become less useful as the process continues. Garments must be worn by real humans in order to determine what happens when people sit down, or bend over, or have sensitive skin. And so, once a designer has a pretty good idea of what it is they are making, they bring in fit models, people who are used to help designers determine the fit of their clothes. If a designer happens to be designing women's pants, they often call on one in particular.

If you've worn women's jeans in the last decade, it's likely that you've stepped into a pair designed to fit the butt of Natasha Wagner, one of the fashion industry's most in-demand denim fit models. Wagner has worked with brands including 7 for All Mankind, Mother, Citizens of Humanity, Re/Done, Paige, Black Orchid, Vince, Proenza Schouler, Gap, Lucky Brand, Old Navy, and Levi's. *Vogue* described her as the woman whose "bottom is shaping the nation." Refinery29 describes her as having "the best butt in the business." Her job is to be the body that stands in for all the rest of us, a body that, like Norma, is simultaneously normal and ideal—the one that all the clothes actually fit.

Wagner grew up in LA and went to college at Cal State Long Beach, where she studied communications, joined a sorority, and worked as a waitress at Chili's. One Friday afternoon, one of her sorority sisters, who was working as a fit model, asked Wagner to ride with her to pick up her paycheck at her modeling

agency, so she could take advantage of the carpool lane. When they arrived, an agent asked if she could measure Wagner. “They measured me and I didn’t think much of it,” she says. “And then they started calling me. It turned out I had the exact measurements they were looking for. I felt like I won the lottery.”

Just what those measurements are, Wagner won’t tell me. When I talk to her on the phone, she speaks of them almost as if they’re a trade secret. So instead, I ask her to describe her butt. She hesitates a bit before settling on “perfectly imperfect.” Judging from photos online, Wagner is a leggy white woman with long blond hair and beachy highlights. She’s thin and conventionally attractive. I find many images in varying degrees of close-up that show her butt in jeans. To me, it’s actually pretty small compared to the general population, though certainly bigger than those of the waifish models of the 1990s—which, according to industry professionals, is the key to her appeal. “If you fit with someone who is too curvy (tiny waist, big butt), or with someone who has a straight body (no hips),” one designer who employs Wagner explained to *Vogue*, “you are limiting yourself to just a certain body type.... She has the best of both worlds where she’s slim and she still has shape.”

It is this perceived averageness that Wagner says makes her a good fit model. “If the company only has a budget for one model, they want someone who’s not too big, not too small, not too tall, or too skinny,” she told me. I’m immediately reminded of the idea of the “too” that dominated the conversations around Norma in 1945. Wagner’s body is in many ways exceptional, even though it is being used as a template for the quintessentially normal.

When Wagner is approached about a job, the first step is an interview at the corporate offices of a clothing brand, where her measurements are taken. For this part of the process, she wears tight spandex, but occasionally, if she trusts the person doing the measuring, she will allow them to measure her in her undergarments behind a curtain. They measure her everywhere: the base of her neck, the width of her shoulders, her bust, her natural waist, her low hip, thigh, midthigh, and inseam. Then, they have her try on a few garments to determine if she is right for the brand.

Because there is no standardization across the garment industry, each brand determines its own metrics, and therefore its own ideal customer. Many of us



have learned this experientially: if you've ever tried on the same size in different brands, you know that there is little consistency from one to the next. According to Glaum-Lathbury, each brand markets itself to a specific kind of customer, which is communicated, in part, by its approach to sizing. If Natasha's measurements—lanky, tall, with a bit of a butt—align with the image or ideal that particular brand is trying to sell, she's the right fit, regardless of how few women share her particular proportions. Garment makers are rarely in the business of making clothes that will work for actual people; instead, they cater to a fantasy of who the customer hopes to be.

After brand representatives meet with Wagner and decide to work with her, the designer provides a sketch of the garment to a pattern maker, who then creates a pattern in Natasha's size. Next, the brand fabricates a prototype from the pattern. In an ideal world, Wagner tries on two or three versions of the prototype and offers recommendations. In each iteration, designers make micro-adjustments to match the garment more precisely to her body, and take Wagner's feedback about construction and feel. From experience, she knows that if belt loops aren't sewed into the yoke seam, they will rip out when people pull up their pants, and that pockets work best if they are a certain shape. Wagner says that when a company achieves the perfect fit, she can just feel it. "The back isn't pulling down. The waistband isn't chafing or cutting. It hugs you in all the right places."

After the initial patterns and instructions, the factory runs what's called a preproduction fit—a sample to make sure what it's making conforms to what the designers had in mind. Wagner usually tries on the preproduction fit and works with the designers to make any minor last-minute adjustments. Then, after the factory goes into production, Wagner tries on the garment for a final time to make sure it is acceptable to send out into the world.

Though Wagner provides the baseline "ideal," companies must be able to generate clothes in more than one size. To do this they each use slightly different mathematical formulas to make larger and smaller versions of the prototype. This process, called grading, is complex. Glaum-Lathbury explains that each size increase adds a proportionately larger amount of fabric, so the difference between a size 2 and a size 4 might be one inch of fabric, but the difference

between a size 14 and a size 16 might be two and a half inches. That fabric doesn't all get added in the same place: the companies try to predict where flesh will be distributed as people get bigger. This means that a neck measurement may not change much at all, but the center front of a garment might add a full inch of fabric. In addition to circumference additions, there are also length additions, the assumption being that a woman who wears a size 4 is shorter than one who wears a size ten. So, as clothing sizes get bigger, it is less likely they will fit.

What baffles me about this—what has always baffled me—is how this method of sizing manages to work as a business model. The garment industry is one of the largest in the world—surely companies would make even more money if their products actually reliably fit their customers? Surely, there has to be a better, and more profitable, way.

Glaum-Lathbury explains that it isn't out of cruelty that our clothes don't fit, but rather due to necessity. "You have to remember, your clothes don't have anything to do with your body," she says. "Clothes are a series of questions related to the bottom line, not the correctness of the product." Because fashion is a volume business, the only way a company can make money is if they sell a huge amount of something, and there are a limited number of ways to make that process more efficient. Although a manufacturer can cut two hundred T-shirts at once, every single one of them has to be sewn by hand. There are no robots that can sew; every garment you have ever worn has been stitched by a human being sitting at a sewing machine. And although the widespread use of sweatshops and other unethical labor practices throughout the history of the garment industry has made this sewing as cheap as possible, it can't be made much cheaper. And so it is impossible to efficiently make clothes in as many sizes and variations as would be necessary for them to actually fit.

"In order for this system to work, our bodies have to be functionally interchangeable," Glaum-Lathbury explains. "Our bodies are a cog within a system." It's an issue she's experienced firsthand: when she had a small clothing line of her own, her goal was to create beautiful, well-made clothes out of lovely fabrics that fit well, but she often ended up making garments that didn't fit that

well on a wide variety of bodies. Even though her goal was to make clothes that fit, she simply couldn't. It just wasn't economically viable.

"Our bodies are unruly," she reminds me, by way of explanation. It's a word that has stuck with me because it suggests our bodies are rebels—against sizes, against capitalism, against the enduring need to order and rank and control—an idea that appeals because it feels so deeply true. I slather on night cream, do squats, and try to stuff myself into a pair of pants that don't quite fit, but I still have wrinkles, cellulite, and a butt that feels like it is shaped incorrectly. My body constantly resists my efforts to control it.

But, of course, not everyone is trying to make their body fit. Not everyone is in search of normal. For some, the unruly nature of the body, and the myriad ways a body can be, are not only something to accept but are, in fact, something to revel in.

# RESISTANCE



Like almost everything else I encountered at Icon in Astoria, Queens, the drink special was joyful, punny, and queer: customers shouted for a “Call Me by Your Rosé,” a fruity drink that paid homage to the movie *Call Me by Your Name*. Two bartenders danced along to “I Touch Myself” by the Divinyls as they shook drinks beneath multicolored spotlights that flooded the brick walls. The room was festooned with rainbow flags.

I was there on a Sunday at seven forty-five p.m., but the place was packed. It was the first night of the Iconic drag competition, an eight-week-long live reality show in which New York-based drag queens came to perform for the Icon crown in front of a rotating panel of judges. That night, eleven drag queens would perform in individual, choreographed performances as well as in something called Drag Queen Roulette, where each contestant would have to create a performance on the spot to a song of the DJ’s choosing.

Outside of the subway, Icon was one of the most diverse spaces I’d ever been to in New York City. There were myriad races, gender presentations, and class markers on display; gay-seeming couples cuddled next to straight-seeming couples, the middle-aged mingled with the young. I stood next to a woman with a buzz cut and a *Friends* baseball cap holding a femme-presenting woman by the waist. In front of us, a drag queen who wasn’t performing that evening obstructed our view of the stage, her silver-sparkle heels and voluminous blond wig rendering her a full foot taller than me. I spent the evening triangulating my view through her mass of curls and the sea of phones held aloft to capture the event live on Instagram.

I went to Icon to see if I could find an antidote to the relentless emphasis on sameness and normalcy woven throughout the history of bodies and size, and to the regulation of gender that was so closely tied to Norma's creation and display. I really couldn't have come to a better place. The theme of the night, "Getting to Know You," was meant to be a vehicle for the performers to introduce themselves to the judges and the crowd, but in many ways it highlighted the underlying reality of any drag performance: each performer gets to be whatever version of themselves they want. The bodies that they created and presented all played with the impersonation of femininity, but each performer interpreted the brief a little differently. Some of the performers looked like characters in a sci-fi movie, donning iridescent skirts and bright blond wigs, and others looked almost old-fashioned, decked out in golden-age-Hollywood dresses and big, curly hair. Some seemed to wear no padding at all, achieving an androgynous, lithe look. Others appeared to have breasts; cleavage emerged from atop bustiers and sweetheart necklines. And some had large, voluptuous butts, created by foam padding strapped underneath ornate dresses and tight pantyhose, which produced a look that read as classically feminine, if there is even such a thing. Over the course of the evening, I took in a performance that imitated the structure and graphics of the video game *Mortal Kombat*, incorporating gymnastics and martial arts. There was a drag queen named Zeta 2K who performed fellatio on a long red balloon, popped it, and then hid it in her mouth for several minutes, only to slowly retrieve it as she wrapped herself in a blanket of stitched-together plastic trash. Another performer, Essence, smeared herself with neon-yellow body paint as she writhed on the ground.

I, of course, took a particular interest in the butts, and was surprised at the range of methods used by the drag queens to embellish, shape, and augment their backsides. There were bare butts highlighted with contouring makeup and unpadded butts that were pancake-flat beneath skirts and dresses. One performer looked like Mae West: her curves were stuffed to appear big and brassy. Another resembled J.Lo, her padding giving her the type of body that comes only with a particular alchemy of genetic luck and hours at the gym. At Icon, butts were something to play with openly, to dial large or small according to taste and personality. The butt, and the body, was a site of joy and disruption

rather than a place of prescription. But how, I wondered, was this multiplicity achieved? Where did all of these glorious butts come from?

---

On a hot July day in 2019, Vinnie Cuccia stood in front of his apartment building in Brighton Beach, a historically Russian neighborhood in Brooklyn where he lived with Alex Bartlett, his partner in life and business. An effervescent man in his fifties, he smoked a cigarette in the courtyard, wearing wraparound sunglasses, slim-cut jeans, and a yellow PFLAG T-shirt. I approached the building as he finished his cigarette, and he told me about how much he loved living in this part of the city, an area where he and Bartlett could afford to live in a building with ocean views. Coney Island was a ten-minute stroll away, and the aquarium was even closer. “Our friends always ask us to go to Fire Island,” he told me. “But we don’t need to—here, we can go to the beach and come back home to go to the bathroom!”

Cuccia and I took the elevator up to the apartment where he and Bartlett lived and worked. When he opened the door, we were greeted by human-sized stacks of ivory-colored foam cut into the shape of enormous, corpulent commas. An entire room was dedicated to these foam chunks, but that didn’t stop them from spilling into the hallway. These materials were the basis of the business Cuccia and Bartlett co-owned: they are perhaps the world’s foremost purveyors of butt and hip pads designed for use by drag queens, cross-dressers, and trans women. Several of the drag queens I had watched at Iconic used their product, as did contestants on *RuPaul’s Drag Race* and other well-known drag queens across the globe.

Bartlett soon appeared to welcome me. Dressed in cut-off shorts and flip-flops, he showed me the bedroom that the couple had transformed into a workshop. Two assistants, both young women planning to pursue a career in fashion, stopped to say hello before resuming their work shaping the foam with electric saws. A shelf near the ceiling held bolts of brightly colored fabric that Bartlett fashioned into costumes, both for himself (he performed in drag as

“Pepper”) and for clients and friends who performed on Broadway and in clubs across the country.

When they opened the business—aptly named Planet Pepper—Bartlett had been doing drag for about twenty years. He had also been sewing costumes for himself and other drag queens out of his apartment. Cuccia didn’t know anything about sewing but wanted to start a small business and had access to \$15,000 from the New York State Commission for the Blind, which was offering start-up money for people with visual impairments (Cuccia is legally blind). The couple decided to use the money to start a costume shop—Cuccia would handle the business side of things and Bartlett would take the creative lead.

At first, Planet Pepper lost money—small fashion companies often run on thin margins and it is rare to turn a profit quickly—but soon the couple realized that there was an associated, and untapped, market: specialized padding for drag queens to wear under their elaborate outfits.

“I was making costumes for people that didn’t have a feminine body, and they wanted to present in a feminine way,” Bartlett explained. “They’d come in looking like dudes and we’d have to basically start with the body and then do the outfit. After a while I realized—there’s nobody doing this. No one is really making hip pads for drag queens and other people who want to present that way.”

Bartlett, who had grown up and then come of age as a drag queen in Virginia, had learned how to make and shape padding the way most drag queens had always learned: his drag mother had taught him how to cut up couch cushions, sculpt them into the desired shape, and stuff them strategically into pantyhose.

“You learn from the people you’re around,” Bartlett explained. “A friend of mine could see I wasn’t padding and was like, ‘It’s time to start thinking about padding because you look like a boy in a dress.’” The first time he stepped onstage in padding, he recalled, was a magical, life-changing moment. “For drag queens, there is this sort of switch that goes off when you figure out your shape. You become a different person. When you have a body and fingernails and boobs, you walk in a different way, move in a different way. You command space differently.”

In the eighties and nineties, the drag community, especially in New York City, dutifully reflected the fashion industry's ideas of what it meant to be feminine and beautiful. While performers in Virginia often crafted their appearance after Mae West and Marilyn Monroe—a look that requires a full backside—Bartlett realized when he arrived in New York City in 1992 that the style was “very androgynous, very rock 'n' roll,” and therefore less padded. “Everybody wanted to be a supermodel, size zero, look like a boy in a dress,” Cuccia added. Even with his visual impairment, Cuccia says he could always tell when he was talking to a drag queen in those days. “I looked right at her hips. They didn't move; they didn't sway.” It took a while, but Planet Pepper eventually found a foothold in the community as styles and outlooks on drag began to evolve and change. “When people think about being a woman, it's all about the breasts and hair and face,” Cuccia says. “But you put these hips on and this butt on, everything changes dramatically. A lot of people say, ‘It changed my look, it changed my life.’”

---

Like many women, I, too, have worn undergarments in an effort to change my silhouette, but unlike Cuccia and Bartlett, for whom the creation of feminine shapes is an act of acceptance, liberation, and rebellion, my attempts to shape my body using padding and spandex have almost always been an exercise in restriction.

The first time I used underwear to conform to predetermined ideals of femininity was in middle school. Before I had any breasts to speak of, I bought bras with a bit of bulk added to the underside of the cup. I tried to strike a balance between a change that might get me noticed and a change that was noticeably false: I wanted to look a touch more developed than I actually was but was terrified that my deception would be discovered. A decade later, as a twenty-four-year-old bridesmaid, I discovered shapewear because I'd forgotten that I would need a slip to wear beneath a gossamer dress at the front of a church. As I steamed the bride's wedding gown in a Sunday school classroom, another bridesmaid rushed to a nearby mall and returned brandishing a tan



spandex tube with bra cups attached at the top. It was from Victoria's Secret and was designed not only to prevent the congregation from seeing through my dress, but also to make me smaller. By the end of the night, my stomach ached—the price of creating a body that felt normal and feminine was an acidic feeling of constipation.

The desire to change the way my body looked was, for me, an attempt at coherence, an effort to match the outside of the body with the inside, to have the self that is seen in the world match some concept of the true self lurking beneath the surface. The padded bra and the body-constricting Spanx each offered an opportunity to more closely align with an ideal of the feminine, to put on a costume and perform a version of femme: I want bigness here and smallness there in order for the outside of my body to cohere to a gender template that I have inherited and internalized. I feel myself—or want to feel myself—as feminine, or adult, or poised. It is an ordering, of both the self and the world. For me, it is often a complicated, conflicting desire: I want to be seen on the outside as something close to who I feel myself to be on the inside, and yet I also want to be seen on the outside as normal, as feminine, as correct.

But femininity is not a singular experience, and the tools we have to communicate it are blunt. Simple, obvious signifiers—a big bosom, a full behind, a slimmed middle—create an illusion of gender that is uncomplicated and binary. A feminine outside suggests a tidy, feminine inside, even if the truth is much more fluid and complex. In many ways, this is the point: to make femininity simple, straightforward, and singular is a way to dodge its nuance. After all, there was no bra that could have communicated the way, at thirteen, I longed for the freedom of being a little girl at the same moment that I craved what I imagined was the agency of womanhood. There was no constipating girdle or flouncy dress that could have made visible the multiple expressions of gender I felt within me as I stood at the front of the church on the day of my friend's wedding. I was polished and lovely, and took pleasure in the fact that I seemed to be pulling off the poise of a cookie-cutter bridesmaid. But I was also standing at the front of an evangelical church, trying to catch the eye of the beautiful butch woman who was my date to the ceremony, both of us squirming as we listened to the pastor assert that marriage was between one man and one

woman. There was a betrayal in that moment: I was passing as a rom-com femme, but my gender and sexuality both remained disguised.

“One is not born, but rather becomes, woman,” Simone de Beauvoir famously tells us in *The Second Sex*. One of the places one becomes a woman is in the aisles of a lingerie store, where the fantasy of another body feels dimly within reach. Beauvoir’s sentiment echoes through the philosophy of gender in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. We see it in the pages of Judith Butler’s *Gender Trouble*, which situates gender as a construction and a performance, rather than as a stable fact. We might wear the accessories associated with what has been deemed “female” or “male,” we may plump and pad and slim, but the internal self cannot be known by these external signifiers, and the contrast between the outside and the inside is often heightened by the performance. There is, in fact, no real internal self at all, according to Butler. The fantasy of a genuine self, a stable notion of “femininity,” is an illusion. There is no normal, there is no feminine. Part of the reason why any singular expression of gender is discomfiting, why earnestly plumping myself up in the ultra-femme dress of the bridesmaid felt so hollow, is that it suggests singularity when there is really plurality. There is a tragedy in that discomfort, but also, maybe, an opportunity. Or, as RuPaul has said: “We’re all born naked, and the rest is drag.”

The product offered by Cuccia and Bartlett at Planet Pepper provides a different way to think about creating a body than what Belskie and Dickinson proffered with Norma, or what I can find in the aisles of a lingerie store. The creation of Norma was an attempt to define, and confine, femininity. When I wear Spanx or make a futile attempt to fit into pants designed for Natasha Wagner’s body, I feel the echoes of those constraints. I’m trying to conform my body to another person’s notion of femininity, another person’s idea of normal.

And yet, Bartlett and Cuccia find freedom in versions of these same garments. For them it is all about the joyfulness of expressing multiple modes of the self. “At some point, it becomes this abstract idea of what is male and female,” says Bartlett. “We go back and forth over time. And for me, I was bored wearing jeans and black tees, and I wanted to wear fun, flashy clothes. I asked myself: Why can’t I wear fabulous dresses? I found a space where I could do that. For me there is a magic in dressing up. I become even more of myself.”

---

Fit

---

# STEEL



In the first panel of a comic strip from 1994, a woman arrives for what appears to be a date wearing a leotard and sweatband. Her male companion wears a suit and tie and sits at a table with a white cloth draped on it. In the second panel, as she takes her seat, a sound resounds through the air: “*CLANG*,” reads the text in enormous bold letters. In the third panel, the date offers his opening line: “So how long have you had buns of steel?”

Thanks (in part) to its name, the fitness phenomenon *Buns of Steel* was ripe for parody in the late 1980s and early 1990s: it was spoofed on *Saturday Night Live*, discussed in Jay Leno’s late-night monologues, and referenced in *Cathy* comics. After all, butts are funny, and the idea of having a butt of steel is both alluring and a little bit ridiculous. But *Buns of Steel* wasn’t a joke, at least not entirely. Based on a workout regimen developed by fitness entrepreneur Greg Smithey, *Buns of Steel* was also a bestselling VHS exercise tape purchased all over the world by people who actually wanted to have metal-hard buns, a fact that spoke to a fundamental shift in expectations about how bodies should look and what they were for.

The butt (or at least the ass) has long been linguistically associated with hard work. Having a “fat ass” is equated with laziness and sloth, as in “get off your fat ass and get to work.” To give a person a “kick in the ass” is to get them going, to make them go to work. To be a “hard-ass” is to be tough and uncompromising. A person can also “work their ass off,” a phrase that makes a direct connection between a small butt and diligent labor. It’s no surprise, then, that these connotations would all come together to form one of the most successful exercise programs in history during a period when commitment to gospels of

entrepreneurship and self-creation in America was reaching new peaks—or that that program was invented by someone whose personal story so thoroughly embodied those principles of success.

---

It took me six months to track Greg Smithey down. I wrote him repeated emails at an address I found on a website he made in 2008. I scoured the phone books of Anchorage and Las Vegas, where I knew he had once lived. I tried to locate his representatives and his relatives. I had all but given up, assuming he had disappeared into the netherworld of the once-famous, when one afternoon I received an email from Smithey saying he'd be happy to speak with me; his silence, he explained, had just been because he doesn't regularly check his inbox.

So I gave him a call. Once he started talking, he didn't stop for three days.

Some of the stories he told seemed dubious. He claimed that he was the “white boy” in the Wild Cherry song “Play That Funky Music” (he wasn't). He said he trained the Commodores and Miss Alaska at his aerobics studio in Anchorage (possible, but unlikely). He told me that he is a storm chaser and has been inside eight typhoons, and described a harrowing encounter with a grizzly bear that he survived by utilizing positive thinking and a big, toothy smile. Recognizing his tendency to self-mythologize and stretch the truth, it's important to take anything he says with a grain of salt. There is, however, one thing that is undeniably true about Greg Smithey: he invented one of the most successful fitness phenomena of the last forty years.

Smithey's interest in fitness began when he discovered pole vaulting at twelve years old. He was good at it—so good that, in 1969, he attended Idaho State on a track scholarship. There he excelled, eventually jumping a very respectable sixteen feet. After college, he decided he wanted to teach physical education and moved to Alaska, where he coached the Wasilla High School track team (he claims he trained Sarah Palin). He liked teaching and coaching, but he was a man with a bigger dream: he wanted to start his own aerobics studio and introduce a new fitness approach to the masses. After attending a life-changing motivational lecture by sound-bite optimist Zig Ziglar, Smithey quit his job, moved to

Anchorage, and, in 1984, opened the Anchorage Alaska Hip-Hop Aerobics Club.

It turned out to be a bumpy transition. Smithey soon found himself in a financial hole, haggling with his landlord for a break on rent and trying to figure out how to attract enough aerobics students to make the business viable. “I was looking at total failure with my exercise studio and I got more angry and more frustrated,” he says. He decided to channel that anger into intense workouts in his aerobics classes. “Specifically, I put together a workout that just burned their butts.”

According to the website he maintains now, Smithey’s classes were filled with wild antics. He brought a cassette tape and a long leather whip (just as a prop, he reassured me), and referred to himself as Dr. Buns, Professor of Bunology, Prince of Pain, Master of Masochism, and the Bunmaster. He taught his class with the lights dimmed, a spotlight on him, music cranked. In fifty minutes, he would guide the group through at least fifty different butt-related exercises, all the while shouting, “Beautiful legs... beautiful legs... work those beautiful legs... and don’t forget to squeeze those cheeseburgers out of those thighs, and that carrot cake... and those french fries!”

Smithey says that, at first, there were only five or six students in his class, but the number quickly grew to over forty repeat attendees. “They were coming because I was causing their butts to hurt so bad. And soon, they started coming in and telling me all these wonderful stories about how their butts look so good and their husbands love it.” He tells me that his greatest moment of inspiration struck while talking to a group of students after class. One of them said: “Wow, our buns feel like steel.” “We all kind of fell silent,” he recalled. They recognized genius when they heard it.

---

Smithey’s timing with *Buns of Steel* turned out to be perfect. Throughout the 1960s and ’70s, the very notion of what exercise was, and who it was for, underwent a profound change. According to fitness historian and New School professor Natalia Petrzela, booms in American fitness culture usually

correspond to rises in white-collar labor. As more people are employed in desk jobs—in the 1920s and 1950s, for example—the people who work those jobs become less active than those who have more physically demanding jobs, a fact that often causes a lot of societal angst. Anxiety about fitness (and its corollary—fatness) permeates middle-class culture in these eras because fitness isn't ever only about having a body that is useful or a body that is healthy. Having a fit body seems to almost always mean something more.

Petrzela explains that, in the United States, the concept of physical fitness is very often linked to patriotism because the perceived physical health and capacity of a nation's citizens has (until recently) been indicative of military might: if you have a strong body, you are better prepared to fight in a war. In the 1950s, for example, there was much concern that the Cold War might turn hot and American men would not be prepared to fight if they were flabby from their *Mad Men*-style office jobs. "People were invested in this idea of America being a superpower," she says, "but there is this anxiety that comes with it, which is, *Oh my God, all of these things that make America great—cars and TVs and washing machines and frozen foods—are actually making America fat and unconditioned.*" It is because of this anxiety that the government initiated programs like the Presidential Physical Fitness Test, designed to promote physical strength and stamina in American children and set them along a lifelong path to vitality.

By the late 1970s, physical fitness would take on another layer of meaning. In response to the increased strength of organized labor over the previous two decades, as well as a new wave of governmental regulations that included the Environmental Protection Agency and Occupational Safety and Health Administration, many of America's wealthy and powerful embraced an economic philosophy that prized the unfettered free market, relentless privatization, and individual liberties. This neoliberal philosophy gradually gained wider purchase across class divides as its boosters promoted it as a remedy to the economic crises of the 1970s, and because it appealed to the persistent American mythos of the self-made man.

But neoliberalism wasn't just an economic philosophy; its tentacles would extend into nearly every part of American life. It conflated the free market with

individual agency, had no use for collective modes of expression or action, and judged the worth of people primarily in terms of market value—ideas that, if taken seriously, would alter how people thought about themselves on nearly every level, including how they perceived their bodies. Although there is a long history of equating a slim body with self-control, in the 1970s, to be physically fit became an important way to demonstrate the values of discipline and self-creation. A fit body became a visual symbol of a hearty work ethic and the ability to control the self, crucial attributes in a country that had a renewed commitment to the idea that the individual controls their own destiny.

It was on the cusp of this boom of individualism that, in 1968, an air force physician named Kenneth Cooper published a book called *Aerobics*, which extolled the virtues of exercise that strengthened not only the limbs and torso, but also the muscles within the heart. Until that point, most Americans associated the concept of “the gym” with bodybuilding, an almost entirely male subculture that was considered deviant, the progeny of circus acts and freak shows. Bodybuilders were perceived as somehow both too feminine—often suspected to be homosexuals because they spent so much time around other men and cared about the way they looked—and too masculine, grotesquely muscled and projecting conspicuous strength. It was such an extreme that much of the general population had no interest in emulating it. The publication of Cooper’s book, however, provided an alternative to building bulky muscle: it promoted exercise as a way to create the lean muscles of a long-distance runner or a dancer. It was a look that appealed to all genders, but particularly women—then, as now, the promises of aerobic exercise were strength and cardiovascular health, but also a way to achieve thinness while increasing and maintaining strength. But the strength associated with aerobic exercise remained within heteronormative limits, avoiding bulk or shapes that might signify masculinity (or lesbianism).

Like human language, aerobic dance—which built on the concepts Cooper presented in his book—emerged in multiple locations at the same time, and it was the primordial ooze out of which many forms of exercise evolved, from spin to barre to Buns of Steel. Judi Missett taught the first Jazzercise class at a Chicago dance studio in 1969, while Jacki Sorensen taught a similar style of



aerobic dancing at a local New Jersey YMCA the next year. The basics of both were remarkably similar: a woman situated herself in front of a group of people and demonstrated rapid, dancelike movements designed to increase heart rates and offered targeted instruction in strengthening specific areas of the body. A class of mostly women would watch and follow along. Class attendees and instructors were clad in tight-fitting, leotard-like garb and moving to upbeat pop music (often disco). Everyone left the class drenched in sweat.

Both Missett's and Sorensen's styles of aerobic dance proved to be enormously popular. Sorensen penned a book and went on a multicity tour, appearing on television and radio programs across the country; by 1981, she had certified more than four thousand teachers to lead aerobics classes. Missett wrote her own book, which sold over four hundred thousand copies, and had the insight to turn Jazzercise into a franchise business that allowed instructors to earn a share of their profits. Jazzercise spread to nearly every corner of the country.

There are a few possible reasons why aerobics became so popular so quickly. To start, both Missett and Sorensen were teaching middle-class, relatively conservative women with families who had at least a little bit of expendable income and free time, women who voted for Reagan and Nixon and made cookies for bake sales, who saw their femininity and vitality as a crucial contribution to the nation. Sorensen's husband was in the air force, and she often taught on base, which helped to spread her workout around the country as she moved from one city to the next.

Perhaps paradoxically, aerobics' rise in popularity was also fueled by the unfolding second-wave feminist movement, which challenged the conflation of femininity and weakness through efforts that included advocacy that led to the passage of Title IX in 1972, giving more women access to competitive sports. For decades, the gym had felt like a hostile place to many women, and a woman who wanted to exercise her body—a fundamental human need—likely would have felt lonely in that desire. To move around—to swim, lift, jump, and run—is a way to feel liberated and connected, a feeling that was hard for many women to access before aerobics came along. From a contemporary standpoint, it's difficult to imagine that pre-aerobics world, a world where regular exercise wasn't a part

of most women's lives, where athletic bodies were considered suspect and masculine. "It really was a big deal... for women to get together and exert their bodies in this rigorous, athletic way," says Petrzela. "It was a big deal for hard, rigorous exercise to be part of what it is to be sexy and feminine."

Missett and Sorensen may have invented aerobics, but there is one person who will forever be credited with making it a global sensation—a woman who would embody its strange blend of leftist politics and conservative, neoliberal hobby.

Jane Fonda, the daughter of screen icon Henry Fonda, had become famous as a theater and comedy actress in the 1960s and then was crowned a sex symbol after playing the title role in the 1968 sci-fi spoof *Barbarella*. Later, she went on to have serious and award-winning roles in films like *Klute* and *Coming Home* but became equally notable for her deep involvement in the political left and the protests against the Vietnam War. In 1972, she made a controversial visit to see the damage American bombings had wrought on North Vietnam with her future husband, Students for a Democratic Society cofounder Tom Hayden, and was photographed sitting on top of a Vietcong antiaircraft gun emplacement. The image shocked many Americans as antipatriotic and earned her the derisive nickname "Hanoi Jane."

It was amid this deeply chaotic moment, when feminists were condemning her as a silly Hollywood sexpot and many Americans were calling her a traitor, that Fonda began to prepare for a new movie role. As part of her training, she began studying aerobics with Gilda Marx, who, like Missett and Sorensen, taught high-energy dance classes designed to whip participants into peak condition. Fonda was hooked—she loved the classes so much that she started teaching her own at a studio in Beverly Hills, and gained a large and devoted following. In 1981, she published an instructional book about aerobics as part of a fundraising effort for the Campaign for Economic Democracy, a radical organization promoting policies to redistribute wealth and protect the environment. The proceeds from the project, she announced, would go toward supporting the campaign's work. The book offered both instruction in aerobics and hundreds of images of Fonda in a leotard, images that would be instrumental in forming the basis for a new kind of body ideal. On the cover, she

sits on the floor of what appears to be a dance studio, propped up on one elbow, legs sticking straight up in the air, grabbing the heel of her pointed foot in a pose that reads as both balletic and tough. Hers was a body that could *do* things, a body that was flexible, powerful, undoubtedly thin, famously desirable, and markedly buttless.

*Jane Fonda's Workout Book* was an instant bestseller and a massive success. People across the country in search of a body like Fonda's rushed to purchase what they saw as an instruction manual telling them how to get it. Two million copies were sold in the first two years, and the book was translated into fifty languages. In 1982, Simon & Schuster cut Fonda the largest royalty check the publisher had ever written. And then came the real moneymaker: VHS tapes.

In the early 1980s, most people didn't have a VCR—videotapes were primarily the purview of film aficionados and pornography devotees. No one had ever made an at-home exercise video. But Stuart Karl, of Karl Home Video, saw an opportunity for wider distribution of Fonda's workout. His wife had given him the idea after she mentioned how gyms and aerobics studios still felt unfamiliar and unwelcoming to many women. Karl reached out to Fonda and convinced her to record her routine, just to see what would happen. She agreed, and they produced the first video for \$50,000 ("a spit and a prayer," is how Fonda herself describes the production). The initial retail price was \$59.95 per tape, which in turn became part of a larger investment, because most people also needed to purchase a VCR, an additional expense of hundreds of dollars.

Despite these economic hurdles, the tapes became a sensation, staying at the top of the video bestseller lists for three years and selling seventeen million copies. (They are still some of the bestselling home videos of all time.) It was a phenomenon that was popular across racial lines—fashion magazines targeted at Black women, like *Essence*, regularly ran features on aerobics, and many aerobics videos, including Fonda's, featured women of color following along in the background, even if the star was almost always white. As VHS tapes became cheaper, aerobics videos also became an accessible way to exercise for women who couldn't afford pricey gym memberships. By the end of the 1980s, Fonda had not only popularized aerobics around the world; she had also become a

fitness icon and laid the groundwork for other instructors—like Greg Smithey—to do the same.

---

By 1987, Smithey was in deeper debt than ever, owing months of back rent, despite his consistently full classes. In a last-ditch attempt to turn a profit in the world of aerobics, he took a page from Jane Fonda's book and decided to record his own instructional workout video, using the butt-burning method he had popularized in Anchorage. He acquired some rent-to-own furniture and arranged fake palm trees inside a studio that he'd painted in tropical pastels. The night before the shoot, he invited students from his class to participate, offering to pay them in pizza and soft drinks. *The Original Buns of Steel* was shot in two takes.

In the video (which is available on YouTube), Smithey doesn't brandish a whip, only too-tight sweatpants, a low-cut tank top, and a sweatband. The production values are low—the lighting is garish, the picture is grainy, and the sound is tinny. The *Anchorage Daily News* later described it as having “an Alaska feel,” a kind way of saying it was cheaply made. The students following along in the background are occasionally out of sync or hidden behind one another. Their outfits, however, are dazzling: metallic blue catsuits with bright purple leg warmers, mustard-yellow harem pants, a bright white leotard with a Floridian landscape emblazoned across the front paired with fuchsia leggings. Smithey is encouraging, almost sweet. “You know you’ve got a great body!” he chirps to the audience. “We gotta do the other leg now!” There is no Prince of Pain here, but the workout is actually pretty hard, if at times a little boring. There are endless variations on donkey kicks and leg raises. A generic soundtrack of smooth jazz plays incessantly in the background.

At first, the videos did not catch fire. In 1988, Smithey only sold 114 tapes, almost all of them in the Anchorage area. It wasn't enough. He was making preparations to close his studio—he could dodge his landlord no longer—and needed to make money to survive. In a last-ditch effort, he tried his luck at an aerobics conference in Anaheim, but he sold only one tape from his homemade

booth, to Ellen DeGeneres's assistant (she was doing stand-up comedy at the event and wanted to use his tape as the subject of one of her jokes).

He finally stumbled upon his lucky break—though he didn't know it yet—when he met a videotape distributor named Lee Spieker. Desperate for cash, Smithey sold Spieker the distribution rights to *The Original Buns of Steel* (though he wisely and crucially retained the copyright to the name), and eventually Spieker sold the tape to a distributor called the Maier Group. Soon after, Smithey disappeared to Guam to become what he calls “the Jimmy Buffett of PE teachers,” while the Maier Group got to work on creating advertisements for their new property (in the late 1980s, customers primarily bought tapes from print ads and catalogs; major video chains were just starting to take off).

Even though most of the people in Smithey's classes were women—and the target audience was female—*Buns of Steel's* cover and promotional materials prominently featured a picture of Smithey and his steely buns as a promise of what you would achieve if you worked out along with the video regularly. Soon Howard Maier, president of the Maier Group, noticed that the video was selling very well in San Francisco, a spike he assumed was thanks to the title as well as what they imagined to be Smithey's roguish appeal to gay men. In order to achieve greater mass-market interest, they decided that they needed a new strategy. They needed someone other than Smithey, someone who, like Jane Fonda, could give female consumers something to strive for. In 1988, Maier found just that in Tamilee Webb, a rising aerobics star who would become the face (and buns) of the “of Steel” franchise for the next ten years, and help make Maier and Smithey *very* rich.

Webb had an ideal pedigree. After earning a degree in physical education and exercise science from Chico State, she moved to San Diego and found herself in the heart of the early-eighties Southern California fitness craze. She started working at the Golden Door, one of the poshest spas in America and a celebrity hot spot. During her first week on the job, Webb trained Christie Brinkley and her mother. “Back then it was called a fat farm,” she told me. “Now it's the Golden Door spa and resort. People pay ten thousand dollars a week to go there.”

For the next three years, Webb worked at several different Golden Door locations, including a couple of tours on the Golden Door's cruise ship, where she spent her days off writing a book called *Tamilee Webb's Original Rubber Band Workout*, which would become a bestseller. By 1986, she was a fitness celebrity of sorts, going on international tours, teaching at aerobics conferences, and filling up classes in San Diego. But what she really wanted was to become a star in the booming world of fitness videos.

In 1988, Howard Maier reached out to Webb, hoping she might be willing to become the face, voice, and body of Smithey's workout regime. According to Webb, a mutual friend told Maier that he should hire her because "one—she knows what she's doing, and two—she's got a butt." As soon as Maier pitched her the project, Webb was in. "I loved training the butt and I thought: *That's a great name*," she says. As an adolescent, Webb had been teased for her "bubble butt," but now she hoped it would make her a star.

Webb diligently rehearsed for *Buns of Steel* in her living room, and after a few weeks, she flew to Denver. She remembers that the set seemed cheesy and low-budget, particularly in comparison to the other videos she'd starred in. The lighting was bad, the crew was sparse, there were no "backs"—the group of people following along in the background. But Webb was a professional; she put on her game face and got to work.

She stood alone on a gray carpeted platform, against a bleak white wall with glass blocks and a strangely empty shelf. The music was barely audible as she earnestly explained that she was demonstrating exercises based on "the latest research in sports physiology." Her blond hair was arranged high on her head in a half-ponytail, and she wore coral-colored fitness bikini bottoms with a sports bra, enormous bulky tennis shoes, and flesh-colored tights. Webb described the experience of shooting the tape as a lonely one, and it seems that way. There is something strangely melancholy about the whole thing—when you watch the tape, it looks like she's being held hostage in a *Golden Girls* prop warehouse.

Despite the awkward setup, the convergence of Tamilee Webb and the phrase "buns of steel" created a hit. "When I got my first royalty check, I was jumping up and down," she told me. It was for about \$20,000. "Then I got the next one, and it was fifty grand. And then it just kept going up." People started

recognizing her in public. At an airport, she bent over to pick something up and someone tapped her on her back and said, “Aren’t you the *Buns of Steel* lady?” She was recognizable based on her butt alone.

Over the next decade, Webb hosted twenty-one more “of Steel” videos. And although her cut wasn’t huge—“Remember, I’m just the talent,” she told me—the videos sold at least ten million copies and, according to Webb, made seventeen million dollars for the Maier Group. Greg Smithey got a significant cut, too, as the owner of the “of Steel” name. “People love the name,” he says. “I made a million dollars off of three words.”

The at-home VHS workout eventually faded from mainstream prominence, thanks to the rise of gym culture, DVDs, and apps, but the legacy of *Buns of Steel* remains a potent reminder of the aspirational promise of fitness culture. *Buns of Steel* pledged to transform its practitioners into something superhuman, to turn imperfect, soft flesh to unyielding metal. The mainstream ideal had shifted yet again, from Norma’s fertile, hearty shape to a pert, muscular, tight butt; a butt forged by thousands of reps of what Jane Fonda called “Rover’s Revenge”; a butt made of steel.

---

When I was around ten or eleven, just as I was starting to understand my body to be something that might be assessed and judged by other people, a friend and I put on the tights we wore for ballet class and the swimsuits we wore to play tea party on the bottom of the neighborhood pool and “did Jane” on the beige carpet in her parents’ basement. We giggled as we squatted and crunched, but rarely did we finish the whole video before growing bored and moving on to other games. It was like playing dress-up; we were practicing what we saw our mothers do, what we understood to be one of the necessary rituals of grown-up femininity. We did donkey kicks on towels and played with the spring-loaded ThighMaster her mom had bought from Suzanne Somers on TV.

Soon, exercise was no longer a game. It was a necessity. I was never any good at sports, and so, by seventh grade, I was trying to train myself to be a runner in order to lose weight and create the slim, fit body that the popular girls on the

school soccer team seemed to inhabit so effortlessly. And I never really succeeded. I could run a few times around the block, but never much more. I regularly told myself the incantations at the heart of the neoliberal myth of exercise: that I lacked discipline, that I was lazy, that my life would be better if I were thinner.

In the years since, I've often longed for the experience of bodily freedom and mastery that some women feel when they play team sports, or climb rocks, or run long distances. But for me, exercise has often felt like a chore, an opportunity to constantly fail. The sense of it as a requirement—an activity that will transform my body into something smaller, something more correct—makes me rebel against it and siphons off any pleasure it might offer. Although I know exercise can be a way to take care of myself, to feel strong and free, it always ends up feeling like another form of self-critique.

This tension between the possibility and the reality of exercise is embedded in the story of aerobics itself—while some argued that aerobics offered an opportunity for women to strengthen and liberate their bodies, its rise ultimately did little to free women from the pressure to conform to a notion of an ideal body. Instead it simply swapped one bodily standard for another and made it every woman's individual responsibility to meet that standard. Aerobics allowed strength training to coexist with a sense of femininity, in part because it never fully challenged a gendered idea of the body. It always emphasized the creation of a body that conformed to conventional notions of femininity—instructors encouraged women to become strong while remaining lean, lithe, and sexually appealing to straight men. Large muscles, butch aesthetics, and big butts were nowhere to be found. The standards of beauty perpetuated by the rise of aerobics and fitness culture in the 1980s didn't so much open up possibilities for how a woman could look, but instead doubled the amount of work she had to do to meet an increasingly high bar. Just as when Paul Poiret and Coco Chanel rid fashion of the corset but demanded bodies controlled by diet, *Buns of Steel* just created another aesthetic mandate.

The fantasy of aerobics, and of exercise more generally, is often a fantasy of transformation and self-improvement: *I will work out to become the best version of myself, to be both the body that is controlled and the body that is doing the*



*controlling*. It is a fantasy of both hyper-responsibility and hypnotic passivity, and each side of the binary is played out in the videos themselves. *Jane Fonda's Workout* and *Buns of Steel* are not dance videos; they don't offer techniques that will ultimately lead to artistic interpretation or self-expression. Instead, when you do the moves, you are following someone else's lead, mimicking them beat by beat in order to become more like them. Aerobics is, by and large, a submissive practice: you stay on your mat, inside your little rectangle, and do as you are told. In that way, aerobics has the consequence of reinforcing and rewarding compliance and uniformity. Even as it helps to cultivate bodily strength, it also teaches passivity and obedience—some of the oldest and most harmful feminine tropes.

The aerobics movement, then, was in the business of creating a new mode not only of fitness, but of femininity. In order to be a proper eighties woman, you needed to look like Jane Fonda or Tamilee Webb. And for women whose bodies could never look like Fonda's or Webb's—women who weren't white, thin, strong, or straight—the fitness revolution created yet another unattainable and oppressive ideal. And yet, despite the fact that the ideal of aerobic fitness was impossible for many, some women who knew that no amount of hard work would give them buns of steel found a way to take pleasure in other things aerobics had to offer.

# JOY



**W**hen I asked Rosezella Canty-Letsome to tell me the story of her life, she started by saying, “I’m a coal miner’s daughter. But I’m not a millionaire.” Canty-Letsome grew up in the 1950s in Connellsville, a small railroad town in Western Pennsylvania, three hundred miles away from where Loretta Lynn’s father mined the same Appalachian coal seam. Canty-Letsome’s family was one of the few Black families in the community, which was still segregated at the time. Her father was active in the civil rights movement, and as a girl, she went to demonstrations and picketed with him in front of stores where Black people couldn’t get jobs. As a teenager, she integrated the workforce at the local five-and-dime, GC Murphy Company.

Canty-Letsome also grew up in a family of large women who felt good about their bodies. “The family I came from had hearty stock,” she says. “My mother weighed two hundred fifty pounds. My grandmother was five feet tall and five feet wide. But there was no shame around that.” They loved food, too. “We would have ice cream or Jell-O or cake for dessert every night. We were a big ice-cream family.” Canty-Letsome was big but says, “I was perfectly happy. I went to the prom. I did everything everybody else did.”

After graduating as valedictorian of her high school class, she went to Howard University to get a degree in elementary education while simultaneously studying for a master’s degree at Antioch. She was prepared for a life as a teacher, but her activist upbringing had also given way to a dream of becoming a lawyer. Though “at that time, it was very hard for Black people to get jobs as lawyers,” she recalls, but she decided to try anyway. She graduated from Howard in 1969 and in 1970 started law school at Duquesne University in

Pittsburgh, where she earned her degree. After working as one of the first Black lawyers at the FCC and getting a master of legal letters from Harvard, Canty-Letsome applied for a job teaching law at Golden Gate University in San Francisco. She showed up to the interview in a mink coat she'd bought at a thrift store.

Sitting in front of an all-white group of administrators, Canty-Letsome realized that they hadn't been expecting a large, accomplished Black woman in a fur coat and were noticeably on edge. Five people barraged her with questions in a tone she found belittling, and they seemed surprised that she could answer them capably. As the interview wore on, Canty-Letsome grew increasingly annoyed. Finally, the subject turned to the thesis she had written at Harvard on Puritan thinking in John Winthrop's concept of law in seventeenth-century New England. "Why did you pick that topic?" one of the interviewers asked her pointedly, suggesting, perhaps, that it was odd for a Black woman to write about such a deeply "white" subject.

"Because I wanted to see how you people think!" Canty-Letsome replied, exasperated. She got the job and relocated to Oakland to become the second Black law professor at the college.

Canty-Letsome had always been a large woman, but around this time, her doctors started telling her to lose weight, concerned that she was getting too heavy after giving birth to two daughters in two years. She responded to her doctor's advice with her usual attitude of action and self-assurance—"You got to take me where I am. This is me. So we gotta deal with this the way it is." She started working out with a friend at an outdoor exercise park, running from the parallel bars to the monkey bars and doing exercises at each stop. "That was always fun," she recalled, "but it was in Berkeley and I had two little kids. It was too far of a trip."

In search of an option a little closer to home, she thought she'd try an exercise tape. Like millions of other women, she bought *Jane Fonda's Workout* on VHS, and although she liked it, she felt it wasn't designed for bodies like hers. She had to modify activities to adjust for her limited range of motion and aerobic capacity, which was discouraging. But then she met Deb Burgard.

---

---

Burgard had also come to the Bay Area by way of Cambridge. She had earned her undergraduate degree from Harvard in 1980, and taken part in consciousness-raising groups and feminist organizations that focused their activist work on women's bodies, an interest that stemmed from her childhood in the suburbs of St. Louis.

There, she had grown up in a relatively traditional 1960s white, middle-class family: her father was a doctor and her mother was a schoolteacher. Like so many other women at the time, Burgard's mother tried numerous diet fads in order to make her body look like Twiggy's or Jacqueline Kennedy Onassis's. Her father was also preoccupied with his physical health and appearance.

Burgard describes herself as a chunky little kid but explains that she was powerfully built. She was strong and athletic, and often teased for it. "I was your worst nightmare for Red Rover," she recalls. She also loved to dance. Her father taught her to jitterbug as a child, and when her parents threw parties, Burgard would sneak downstairs after her bedtime and dance in her pajamas in the middle of the room in front of all the adults, who found her antics hilarious and charming.

Despite her love of physical movement, Burgard's parents worried about her weight. By the time she was thirteen, her mother had already taken her to a Weight Watchers meeting. Throughout her teenage years, she dieted repeatedly, losing weight and then putting it back on. Between her freshman and sophomore years of college, she lost thirty pounds. It was a goal she'd been working toward for years, but when she finally achieved it, Burgard realized that losing the weight had come at a huge cost. For the first time since she was a child, when she touched her hips, she could feel the bones protruding, a sign of the physique she'd long coveted. But she also felt dissociated from her body after months of eating too little. "I started thinking to myself: *What the fuck are you doing? Why are you doing this?*" Burgard recalls. She realized how privileged she was: she was studying at Harvard and had meaningful friendships and relationships. Any success she achieved and power she felt would be because of those things, not what the scale read. "It was a huge thing. I realized: *I'm not going to win this game and I want to play a game I can win.*"

In 1983, Burgard moved to the Bay Area with the mission of helping fat women find a way to feel as good as she had when she was dancing in her parents' living room. Along with several other women in the region, she began offering aerobics classes to fat women, a revolutionary idea that not only expanded the possibilities of who could participate in aerobics but fundamentally reimagined the purpose of it as a whole.

The principles of her class were simple: "You don't have any obligation to do exercise if you're a fat or higher-weight person. You don't have to exercise at all. But you absolutely have a *right* to exercise." The distinction between want and need, she explains, was crucial. "I wanted to flip the association of movement for fat people from punishment and atoning to basic human rights."

Burgard's classes were a carefully crafted combination of choreographed exercises, free-form dance, and strength movements, and the intended audience was specific. "I advertised the class as being for women over two hundred pounds because I wanted to be extremely clear that I wasn't talking about somebody who thinks their thighs are a little fat," Burgard explained to me. "I was really trying to make this a space for people who regularly experienced weight stigma in the world."

In *Great Shape*, a fitness guide for large women Burgard later cowrote with Pat Lyons, the authors explain why they choose to use the words *large* and *fat* rather than *obese* or *overweight*. "Our use of the word *fat* is an attempt to normalize its meaning, to detoxify the word by using it in a matter-of-fact, descriptive way." Like activists in other social movements, they intended to reclaim the words that had oppressed them and aspired to reimagine what was possible for people who often felt excluded from mainstream fitness culture. "We have found that some of the miseries we attributed to our weight were in fact miseries of lives without movement, lives without play, lives without deep breathing and zest," Lyons and Burgard say in *Great Shape*. "And lo and behold, movement, play, deep breathing, and zest could be ours *right now*!" Then they ask a crucial question: "Could physical activity be an end in itself?"

Burgard called her classes We Dance and held them at parks and recreation departments and dance studios in Oakland and North Berkeley throughout the mid-1980s. Some of the rooms felt like gymnasiums, and some had ballet barres

and mirrors. Anywhere with a large, open floor big enough for a group of women to have some space to dance worked for her. One of the highlights of each class, she says, was when she would crank up the music—Earth, Wind and Fire; funk; R & B; and disco—and encourage everyone to groove. Sometimes she'd try the old-school dances from the fifties, like the stroll, the pony, the boogaloo, or the mashed potato, offering choreography. Then, breaking with the conventions of traditional aerobics, she'd encourage her class to make up their own steps.

When Canty-Letsome tried Burgard's class, she was excited: she had found a place where large women could exercise free from judgment. "The class was doable. It was low impact. It was great," she says. Unfortunately, though, she confronted the same challenges as before: she had two kids and a busy job and no time to travel to exercise.

Seeking a solution, Canty-Letsome invited a friend from Howard to her house, and together they did some of the modified exercises from Burgard's class. After a few of these DIY home aerobics classes, Canty-Letsome realized she wanted to offer a class like Burgard's to the women of Oakland and started to attend classes to learn how to be an exercise teacher. "Of course, no one in the class was heavy. It was only me," she recalls. Being the only Black woman in a room wasn't new, so it didn't bother her much to be the only heavy woman in an aerobics class full of skinny women either. "I've always known who I am," she says.

After getting certified to teach aerobics, Canty-Letsome bought insurance and found a space to teach twice a week at the Oakland YMCA, fitting classes around her responsibilities as a law professor. She made it work by bringing her young daughters to the YMCA with her, dressed in leotards and tights.

The class, which she called *Light on Your Feet: An Exercise Class for Large, Lovely Ladies*, started with warm-ups and then added exercises that targeted different body parts. There was stretching and floor work, but if a student couldn't get on the floor, Canty-Letsome told them to just do what they could. "Your body is telling you what you need to do," she advised, prioritizing comfort over complex acrobatics. "I wanted them to recognize they were in a safe space,"

she says. “You could say anything you wanted to say. You could moan and groan.”

The environment of acceptance and openness led to a larger shift, Canty-Letsome noticed, in the racially diverse clientele that attended the workouts. Her students, she recalls, “started out hiding their bodies and wearing plain old sweatsuits,” since much of the existing athletic wear didn’t cater to fatter bodies. But eventually they began to make their own outfits, “showing up in pink and purple leotards, looking gorgeous.” Her own favorite was a red-and-white-striped leotard with a belt, tights, and leg warmers. “The tights always matched everything,” she recalled. Burgard remembers her fashion fondly, too. “I had lots of leotards, lots of unitards, and I would layer them. They were all different bright colors. I had these pants that cinched right under my knee. I looked like a jester.”

Jenny Ellison, curator of sport and leisure at the Canadian Museum of History, says that Canty-Letsome’s and Burgard’s classes were part of a larger fat fitness movement in the 1980s that had iterations across North America, particularly along the West Coast. In Vancouver, a woman named Kate Partridge founded a group called Large as Life, offering aerobics classes, community, and fitness-based outings. A short-lived chain of fitness studios called Women at Large opened across the United States and southwest Canada. In the back of *Great Shape*, Burgard and Lyons list almost fifty different fitness classes for fat women, many with punny names like Ample Opportunity and Positively More.

According to Ellison, the politics of these classes were disparate: Some, like Burgard’s, were overtly feminist. Others, like the Women at Large studios, tried to mainstream fat fitness by rendering it more girlish: “They had to wear ultra-feminine uniforms. They insisted on calling their patrons fluffy ladies.” Women came to the classes from different communities and for different reasons. Some felt excluded from fitness culture and wanted to find a way to participate; some wanted to prove that they could be both fat and fit at the same time. “Most of the women weren’t dying to be thin,” Ellison says. “There are people for whom ‘buns of steel’ is never going to happen. That was at the heart of their critique: that ideal was a lie, and it was not attainable for everyone.”

Before long, both *Light on Your Feet* and *We Dance* attracted national media attention. Journalists from the *New York Times* and the *Houston Chronicle* covered the fat fitness phenomenon in the Bay Area, and Canty-Letsome even did a segment on *The Phil Donahue Show*. But most of the coverage positioned fat fitness as a strange phenomenon rather than a necessary corrective to the pervasive aerobics culture. They also largely shied away from reporting on the more radical aspects of what Burgard, Canty-Letsome, and other fat aerobics activists were offering: the idea that fat aerobics was not about losing weight but about enjoying movement as an end in itself.

The promise of *Buns of Steel* was that it could help you sculpt a butt that was strong, but the title suggested something even more—that the video could help create a butt that transcended the limitations of the flesh, that freed a person from the inescapable imperfections and indignities of the body. A butt of steel is not a human butt; it's a butt that is manufactured, a butt that is uniform. It is a butt honed and perfected. But as we've seen again and again, bodies cannot be made uniform. Flesh always resists.

Women like Burgard and Canty-Letsome made a movement out of this resistance. In a world where a fat butt connoted laziness and a lack of self-control, the women who did fat aerobics were proving that they, too, could be fit and in control, deliberately pushing back against the bullies who had told them to get off their lazy lard-asses. They were also saying: *This fat butt is a joyful butt, it is, in fact, a fit butt, and this joyful and fit butt is none of your business*. They were embracing the reality of a body and all of what bodies are capable of doing. Burgard describes it to me this way: “My whole witchery around this my entire life has been to just create spaces of joy and to channel this joy into the world so that people understand: This is your birthright. You get to feel joy in your body if you want to.”



---

# Bootylicious

---

# KATE



Besides my own, the butt I probably thought about the most in the 1990s was attached to Kate Moss. At five foot seven, she was considered short for a fashion model, but what she offered made up for it: a rail-thin body, chic androgyny, and an icy air of indifference. Discovered in 1988 at age fourteen, Moss quickly became an iconic and unrelenting presence in the visual culture of the nineties as the fashion industry shifted away from the tall, tan, strong models of the previous decade. Before the turn of the twenty-first century, she appeared on the cover of American *Vogue* six times and international editions of *Vogue* thirty-two times, and was the face of campaigns for Dior, Burberry, Chanel, Versace, Dolce & Gabbana, and, most famously, Calvin Klein. She had also become one of the highest-paid models in the industry.

Moss's gaunt physique and her bony, youthful look would become an archetype for mainstream body ideals in the media landscape of the 1990s, conveying an air of rebellion and bohemianism, a potent combination that made me long to look like her, even though I knew I never could. I imagined that if I had a body like hers, I'd be able to access spaces that felt beyond my reach: places of authenticity, dark glamour, and, of course, rock 'n' roll.

It was an association that I made because Calvin Klein wanted me to: in 1991, Moss shot her first campaign with the designer, sitting topless on the floor in a loose-fitting pair of blue jeans, so waifish that her spine protruded like the spiky vertebral plates of a stegosaurus. Her face was blank, her expression enigmatic, and she looked discomfitingly young. The ad made Moss the most visible emissary for the look that came to be known as "heroin chic," a corporatized version of a style that had its roots in the era's grunge music scene.

Grunge was a raw, stripped-down, guitar-based response to the hyperconsumerism, conservative politics, and corporate dominance of the Reagan 1980s, and the resulting recession that had dramatically limited working- and middle-class opportunity in the United States. But grunge was also a look, a repudiation of conventional beauty standards that aestheticized and glamorized harsh working-class realities with tattered secondhand clothes, long and dirty hair, and gaunt, undernourished bodies. The grunge body, for both men and women, was androgynous and thin, and often unabashedly evoked IV drug use.

Despite the fact that the artists who hatched this aesthetic explicitly rejected bourgeois, corporate values (or at least seemed to at first), the corporations they condemned were tantalized by the opportunity to shift from the ultraglam, “built” era of Brooke Shields and Christie Brinkley and into something new. “I didn’t want these girls... who had big bosoms,” Calvin Klein explained in 2017. “They augment their bodies. They used artificial implants and things. I found that offensive. I found it really unattractive, unhealthy, and a bad message to send.” Although the actual difference between the bodies of fashion models in the 1980s and those that interested Klein in the 1990s was nominal—both were unquestionably tall and thin, even if the new nineties look was less muscular and less traditionally feminine—Klein was on the hunt for the one thing fashion always seeks: novelty. And in the look of grunge, and the body of Kate Moss, he found it.

Of course, this was hardly the first time that skinniness and curvelessness had been associated with stylish rebellion. In the late nineteenth century, the sickly, tubercular body became linked with bohemianism and counterculture, as typified by Rimbaud and Keats. (“When I was young, I could not have accepted as a lyric poet anyone weighing more than ninety-nine pounds,” said Romantic poet and critic Théophile Gautier.) In the 1920s, flappers had effaced their feminine curves to assert and represent a new type of sexual and political freedom. And although the flapper look was born of the optimism of the boom years of the twenties, the underlying symbolism that equated the thin, androgynous woman with rebellion and nonconformity persisted, an association that would wind its way through various other twentieth-century

countercultural eruptions, including the beatniks, hippies, and punks, each of whose style would be quickly appropriated by mainstream fashion.

While fashion designers in the 1990s were enthusiastic about this willowy, enervated new look, middle-class white parents were wringing their hands: despite what Klein claimed, they saw nothing healthy about what seemed to be an endorsement of smack shooting and anorexia. The fact that the gaunt look was rapidly proliferating in the pages of *Vogue* and *Seventeen* prompted outcries from parents' groups and sparked headlines like "How Thin Is Too Thin?," "Heroin: A Model Way to Die," and "The Perfect Embodiment of Degraded Pop Culture." The fears were widespread enough that, in 1997, President Bill Clinton publicly decried "heroin chic" because it supposedly promoted drug use.

But that cautionary message was lost on their children, who made up the dominant consumer base of Calvin Klein and other brands that employed extremely thin models to sell their products. (In my own middle school, the hallways stank of CK One, and a peek of the Calvin Klein logo on a pair of boxer shorts was the epitome of cool.) When Moss posed with Mark Wahlberg in a Calvin Klein underwear ad in 1992, it was a phenomenon. There he was, built and hunky; her, bony and fragile, standing topless in bleach-white "Calvins," as the underwear would come to be known. Her butt is to the camera—it's there, but like the rest of her, it's skeletal.

Kate Moss's was perhaps the most prevalent, most visible butt of the first half of the 1990s, but it wasn't much of a butt. It was a small lump on the back of an otherwise curveless white woman, whose overall lumplessness was an essential part of her appeal. At the time, it seemed as though a tiny, flat butt would remain the ideal and the goal for most women in America, as it had been for decades previous. What few (including myself) seemed to realize was that a reckoning of sorts was coming, and the dominance of waifish butts was, in fact, quite precarious. Ideas about beauty, bodies, and sexiness that had long been ignored by mainstream, white culture were just beginning to gain a foothold, a cultural shift that, over the next thirty years, would radically transform what many people thought a butt should look like.

# MIX



*Oh—my—God, Becky, look at her butt.”*

It’s 1992, and Becky and her friend—two white women wielding jean jackets and Valley girl accents—are busy leering at a Black woman in a tight yellow dress as she slowly rotates on a raised platform through an arched doorway. The woman doesn’t seem to know she’s being watched as she bends over and rubs her hands along her butt and thighs.

Becky’s friend sucks her teeth and continues:

“It is so big! She looks like one of those rap guys’ girlfriends. Who understands those rap guys? They only talk to her because she looks like a total prostitute, ’kay?”

An infectious bass line drifts in over their conversation; the platform beneath the woman in the yellow dress begins to slowly spin.

“I mean, her butt is just so big. I can’t believe it’s just so round. It’s like *out there*. I mean, gross!” The girls just can’t fathom the size of this woman’s butt; they can’t believe anyone could find it attractive or how the woman herself could be comfortable displaying it in public. One of them summarizes their confusion and revulsion in four short words: “She’s just so... Black.”

Suddenly, Sir Mix-A-Lot appears in a leather jacket and fedora, standing atop a giant, disembodied, yellowy-gold butt that rises from the floor. His feet rest on the cheeks, his legs straddle the crack. Barely a breath passes between the conclusion of Becky’s friend’s monologue equating big butts with prostitution and Blackness and the man’s enthusiastic, now-iconic retort: “I like big *butts* and I cannot lie!”

For the next four minutes, he raps with gusto as women in skintight gold outfits shake their butts at the camera, decapitated by the top of the frame. At one point, five dancing women are filmed from above as they stick their butts into the middle of a circle, mimicking a Busby Berkeley routine. Meanwhile, a DJ scratches a record with a small plastic butt covering the record spindle. Bananas, peaches, lemons, tangerines, and tomatoes flash on the screen, proudly unsubtle stand-ins for butts and breasts and penises.

Sir Mix-A-Lot has something to say in “Baby Got Back,” and he’s going to make sure the Beckys, as they have come to be called, and the world, hear it: he likes big butts, and he believes other men do, too. He is certainly not going to be dishonest about this fact. What the Beckys declare as “gross” about other women’s bodies, and perhaps even their own, Sir Mix-A-Lot celebrates and proudly objectifies. Where they are horrified, Sir Mix-A-Lot is titillated.

Despite the video’s visual puns and the song’s bouncy beat, Sir Mix-A-Lot has always made it clear in interviews that “Baby Got Back” is not a novelty song and is not meant to be a joke. In fact, he wrote it with a message in mind, a message inspired by the experience of his girlfriend at the time, Amylia Dorsey-Rivas, a mixed-race woman with a big butt. “There was one event that was irritating the shit out of me,” he told *Vulture* for their oral history of “Baby Got Back” in 2013. “Amy and I were at a hotel on tour, when we saw one of the Spuds MacKenzie ads for Budweiser during the Super Bowl.... These girls in the ad: each one was shaped like a stop sign, with big hair and straight up-and-down bird legs.”

That stop-sign look, a holdover from the 1980s, struck Sir Mix-A-Lot as ridiculous. “Unless you were in the hood,” he says, “women who had curves—and I’m not talking about women who are shaped like me, with a gut, but women who ran five miles a day, with a washboard, six-pack stomach and a nice round, beautiful, supple ass—wore sweaters around their waist!” He didn’t find the big-haired, bird-legged women on his television sexy, and neither did his friends. But they were the sort of women dominating the pop culture landscape of the period, and as a result, Dorsey-Rivas, an actress and voice artist, was having a hard time finding gigs. “Where I grew up, in the suburbs of Seattle, if you weren’t built like Paris Hilton you weren’t appreciated,” she told *Vulture*.

“You could have the highest cheekbones in the world, but if you were a little more broad at the beam, forget it.” When Mix, as Dorsey-Rivas calls him, asked her why she couldn’t seem to get work, she’d say: “Look behind me.”

“I knew for a fact that many artists felt that if they didn’t use a skinny-model-type woman in their video, then mainstream America would reject the song,” Mix explains in the *Vulture* oral history. He wanted to change that. He wanted big-butt women to feel proud of what was behind them and be given opportunities to represent themselves in the media. He decided to write a song that championed what he saw as the bodies of Black women, a song that celebrated the part of Dorsey-Rivas’s body that he liked the most. For Mix, it was just as much a political statement as it was a personal one.

From the start, the people involved in producing the song and video for “Baby Got Back” interpreted it differently: some found it hilarious, others uncomfortable and objectifying, still others empowering. Dorsey-Rivas was enlisted to voice the spoken-word opening of the song, impersonating the voices of white women who found butts like hers “gross.” She liked the song, she told *Vulture*, and even found it profound, an opportunity to be seen. “People said [‘Baby Got Back’] was degrading,” she said. “But I would say there’s not one thing degrading about that song to anyone who felt like me.” The video’s director, Adam Bernstein—best known for his work with the Beastie Boys, the B-52s, and They Might Be Giants—initially felt otherwise: “When I heard the song for the first time, I thought it objectified women,” he said. “But it made me laugh.”

These differences were reflected in the video’s costume design: Mix wanted the dancers to be dressed more sporty than sexy, but when he arrived on set, he saw the woman on the pedestal dressed in a blond wig, tiger shorts, and gold chains. “This song is called ‘Baby Got Back,’ not ‘Baby’s a Ho,’” he angrily told Bernstein. As Dan Charnas, VP of A&R at Def American Recordings, explained, “The girls in the video were cast by people who didn’t quite understand what they were engaged in culturally.” It seemed that many of the white people involved—including Bernstein—couldn’t reconcile the idea that women with big butts could be desirable without being grotesquely sexualized.

The video production also confronted another one of the inevitable obstacles when discussing butts: they needed to make sure it was clear they were talking about the cheeks and not the hole. The song wasn't about anal sex or the taboos around feces, an important distinction. When Mix came to the set dressed in a brown suit and suggested that he rise up out of the crack of the fifty-foot gold butt, he was quickly talked out of both notions.

When the completed "Baby Got Back" video was submitted to MTV, the standards and practices department decided against airing it, citing a new station policy forbidding the broadcast of music videos that showed women's body parts without also showing their faces. The channel had decided that it would no longer cut women up into pieces with the camera, and it pushed for a very low standard of visual feminism: make sure women are rendered as whole people, literally. They didn't need to be represented as people with hopes and dreams and careers. Just heads. As Patti Galluzzi, MTV's senior vice president of music and talent at the time, explained to *Vulture*, "We were trying to move away from MTV's recent past, when videos showing slices of pie would drop into a girl's lap, like in Warrant's 'Cherry Pie,' were shown around the clock." Those videos, she noted, were sexual and sexist, and both conservative groups like Tipper Gore's Parents Music Resource Center and feminist organizations like Women Against Pornography had pushed MTV to stop airing that content. It was a nominal gain for a certain kind of feminism that MTV was being proactive in their response, but there was some question as to whether "Baby Got Back" was disqualified from broadcast due to sexism and objectification of women, or whether it was simply too butt-forward and Black-forward. According to Sir Mix-A-Lot, the song and video were doing something different from what Warrant was doing with "Cherry Pie." Mix saw himself as critiquing objectification and challenging dominant, white beauty standards. Most rock videos were blatantly sexist, but "Baby Got Back" was, according to its creator, about that sexism, or at least about racism. Celebrating the curvy Black female form, Mix thought, shouldn't be lumped in with the worst offenders of early nineties pop culture misogyny.

Despite Mix's intended political message about changing beauty standards, the video shows that Mix certainly wasn't interested in erasing them. The



women on-screen weren't exclusively stop signs, but they were still exclusively *something*. They were hourglasses—"little in the middle but she got much back"—women who were encouraged to maintain their bodies by "do[ing] side bends or sit-ups," even as they were praised for having a specific repository of fat. In the song, Mix is still dictating what constitutes a "correct" body, even if he is slightly altering the definition, and he is also reinforcing the stereotype that Black women definitionally have big butts, something that is, of course, not true.

And then, there is the woman Becky is shaming, standing on the literal pedestal at the beginning of the video. Her face is never clearly shown; her physical existence is defined by her backside. It's as though she is a sculpture on display at a museum or a showroom—an uncomfortable, and likely unconscious, callback to Sarah Baartman's display in both life and death. Although there is much that is different in this gesture of exhibition—perhaps most notably, Mix is trying to demystify the big butt and make it acceptable and admirable rather than freakish—it is still literally objectifying a Black woman. And, as is so often the case, the only way a woman's body can be seen as normal, or allowed, is if it is first brought into the realm of male desire. Mix aggressively sexualizes the butt, asserting that this body part that mainstream white culture has deemed "gross" is actually a good thing—not because all bodies are beautiful or even acceptable, but rather because "when a girl walks in with an itty-bitty waist and a round thing in your face, you get sprung." In the song, women's bodies exist for the visual pleasure of men, and it is men who are declaring what is allowed and what is attractive.

"That video does not pass the Bechdel Test," ethnomusicologist Dr. Kyra D. Gaunt, assistant professor of music and theatre at the State University of New York at Albany, told me without hesitation, referencing the popular metric that examines female representation in films. She sees the song and video as playing in racist, fetishizing stereotypes, despite Sir Mix-A-Lot's insistence that the song is empowering. Although some women see it that way, for Gaunt, the sort of power the song is offering to women is not one she's interested in. At best, she says, "Baby Got Back" is presenting what she calls "empowered misogyny" where spectacle and fetish are substituted for political power.

To explain, she points out that the early nineties was a terrible time for Black women interested in gaining actual political or economic power. She's right: Anita Hill testified in Congress in 1991, where she was grilled by a group of white men about her experience with sexual harassment, their questions and the accompanying media coverage often playing into stereotypes of the oversexed Black woman. Politicians in the 1990s were also busily creating policy—like the 1996 welfare reform bill—that disproportionately harmed Black women and trafficked in racist stereotypes about “welfare queens.” That same year, Black women were paid on average 34 percent less than white men, and throughout the decade, Black women were experiencing intimate partner violence at a rate 35 percent higher than white women. For Gaunt, whatever “empowerment” was on offer in a video like “Baby Got Back” did little to grapple with the structural racism deployed against the women it purported to celebrate.

But ethnomusicologist Christopher Smith, author of the book *Dancing Revolution*, suggests that those who read the video as exclusively objectifying may be missing something, too. He identifies the dancing in “Baby Got Back” as part of a tradition in hip-hop videos of the period (and West Coast crunk specifically) that used the dancers to telegraph “a powerfully physical, visible, and independent expression of the rhythm track,” unlike the dead-eyed gyrating dolls in videos like “Cherry Pie.” They were asked to freestyle at several points in the song, he notes, offering up their own improvisational choreography, which indicates individual agency. For Smith, the dancers are not mere adornments but are at the very core of what “Baby Got Back” is. Their butts are uninhibited, unrestrained, no bustle or girdle in sight to control them.

In 1992, Mix had a conversation with Galluzzi at a radio conference in Seattle, hoping to convince her that his video shouldn't be included in her network's ban on controversial content, telling her “that he felt the message of the song is that all women are constantly bombarded with images of super-thin models on TV and in magazines, and... that women and young girls need to hear that not everyone feels that way.” That idea spoke directly to Galluzzi, who, although white, was a curvy woman herself. “I had back and front, then and now,” she says. And so she went to MTV and made a case to the higher-ups. They relented and allowed the video to be played after nine p.m.

---

“Baby Got Back” was (and is) many things—silly, weird, catchy, a little bit embarrassing. It’s easy to dance to and undeniably funny. Despite Mix’s protestation, most people think of it as a novelty song, likely because the word *butt* is featured so prominently and frequently. It isn’t particularly aggressive or obscene, instead deploying a warm, goofy jollity to convey its message. Mix shouts *butt* over and over again, and although he uses plenty of other euphemisms—*back* and *booty* most prominent among them—his use of the word *butt* makes the song feel childish, like a joke a second grader would tell. The song seems to invite you into its world to laugh, sing, and dance along with it. At weddings, bar mitzvahs, and high school dances across the country, white boys and Beckys would shout joyfully along, not realizing, perhaps, that they are the villains of the song’s world.

It was also very, very popular. In 1992, “Baby Got Back” was number one on the *Billboard* Hot 100 for five weeks, and it stayed on the charts for seven months. That year, it was the second-best-selling record, surpassed only by one of the bestselling songs of all time, Whitney Houston’s “I Will Always Love You.” After three months, it went double platinum. In 1992, it won a Grammy for best solo rap performance. To date, the song has earned more than one hundred million dollars.

I was still in elementary school when “Baby Got Back” came out, which meant by the time I was dressing up for school dances, the song was a fixture of Midwestern public high school DJ sets. As I stood on the edge of the linoleum-floored cafeteria at a succession of homecomings and Sadie Hawkinses, the lights would dim, and the first chords would fill me with dread, as well as those iconic first words: *Oh—my—God, Becky, look at her butt*. Even though I had a big butt, I knew, on some level, the song wasn’t about me. I even knew that the song was making fun of the tiny-butted white women who adorned the covers of my copies of *YM* and *Seventeen* magazines. But I still felt humiliated because it called so much attention to the difference between the way I looked and the way that I wanted to look. Whatever larger messages Mix was trying to communicate had not meaningfully penetrated the walls of my high school. He may have liked

big butts, but all that mattered to me was that I did not—and neither, it seemed, did anyone else I knew.

“It seems like a benign joke,” Kyra Gaunt says. “Just like every dumb-blonde or twerking joke seems benign.” And yet, it is these kinds of jokes that form our stereotypes and our ideas of ourselves. They sneak into our unconscious mind, because we aren’t ever invited to think very hard about them. “All novelty songs turn on these kinds of stereotypes as far as I can tell. They turn on something that has a serious valence, and then we make light. We can fool ourselves into thinking that we are thinking and talking about something seriously, but we’re not.” In describing the insidious ways a song like “Baby Got Back” can cause harm, Gaunt points to the most famous part of the song: the beginning, where the two Beckys call the big-butted woman “gross” and a “prostitute.” “Everybody has committed it to memory,” she says, “but as [the listener] parrots that positionality, you train your mind to tolerate it.”

In high school, we would all stand on the dance floor, waiting for the beat, and chant along with a Valley girl accent: “She looks like a total prostitute... I mean, gross... She’s just so Black.” And although we were mocking, although we were goofing around, although “it’s just a song; it’s just a joke,” as we said those words out loud, we inscribed them in our minds, infected ourselves with or reinforced those stereotypes. Gaunt calls it a type of epigenetics, a way that we unconsciously encode racist ideas about Black women in our minds. What potentially makes it worse, she says, is that while this is happening, the song is positioning itself as something with a positive message, and the listener can believe that they are actually doing something good by listening to it. “You get to feel like you’re supporting a Black rapper who is trying to do something for Black women. But nobody ever asked Black women what they thought.”

---

Of course, “Baby Got Back” is not the only song about butts. It wasn’t even the only song about butts that was popular in 1992. That same year, Wreckx-n-Effect released “Rump Shaker,” which climbed to number two on the *Billboard* Hot 100. (It, too, was thwarted by the mighty power of Whitney Houston’s “I

Will Always Love You,” which stayed at the number one position for a record fourteen weeks.) The video was made up almost entirely of Black women dancing in bikinis on Virginia Beach. Sometimes one of them played a saxophone, but the focus was gyrating bodies and, not surprisingly, shaking rumps. Once again, the video was banned by MTV.

“Rumps ain’t dirty,” Teddy Riley, who cowrote and produced the single, told the *Los Angeles Times* in 1992. He recalled being frustrated that other artists, like Prince, were allowed to sing about so-called dirty things in their videos and faced no consequences from MTV, yet butt-related videos were verboten. “We don’t make them dirty. They’re just shaking a little. It’s harmless fun, paying respect to females and not making fun of them,” he explained. “It’s something about the behinds that gets people riled up.”

The album that got people *really* riled up was 2 Live Crew’s *As Nasty as They Wanna Be*, one of the most controversial records of the late 1980s and early 1990s, and another butt-focused endeavor: the cover featured four women in string bikinis on the beach, butts facing the camera, faces turned away, appearing basically nude. Throughout their career, 2 Live Crew recorded a lot of music about butts, including the 1990 song “Face Down Ass Up.” They were part of the hip-hop subgenre of Miami bass, also called “booty music,” which paired deep, resonant bass sounds with hissy cymbals and plentiful butt-oriented lyrical content.

2 Live Crew was proudly bawdy, even crass. The hit single off *As Nasty as They Wanna Be* was “Me So Horny,” a song that sampled a line of dialogue spoken by a Vietnamese sex worker character in the film *Full Metal Jacket*, turning it into a chanted, repeating chorus. The song featured lines like “Put your lips on my dick, and suck my asshole, too / I’m a freak in heat, a dog without warning / My appetite is sex, ’cause me so horny.”

It is perhaps not shocking, then, that when the album came out in 1989, conservative groups went ballistic. Although Tipper Gore and the Parents Music Resource Center had successfully lobbied the music industry to apply parental advisory stickers on albums with violent or “offensive” lyrical content, it was clear by the early nineties that a mere sticker wasn’t going to deter young people from buying controversial records. Despite being banned by most radio stations,

*As Nasty as They Wanna Be* sold extremely well, climbing to number thirteen on the *Billboard* weekly charts. In several states, retailers were prosecuted for selling the record because it was deemed “obscene,” and members of the band were arrested after performing their songs in Florida.

The subsequent trial was an enactment of the tension in the 1990s between free speech and vulgarity, as well as the growing anxiety in white, middle-class communities about the popularity of Black culture among white youth. A wide array of music critics testified on behalf of 2 Live Crew, and lauded historian and professor Henry Louis Gates Jr. wrote an op-ed in the *New York Times* that pointed to the fundamental misunderstanding at the heart of the charges. “2 Live Crew is engaged in heavy-handed parody, turning the stereotypes of black and white American culture on their heads. These young artists are acting out, to lively dance music, a parodic exaggeration of the age-old stereotypes of the oversexed black female and male. Their exuberant use of hyperbole (phantasmagoric sexual organs, for example) undermines—for anyone fluent in black cultural codes—a too literal-minded hearing of the lyrics.”

Despite this defense, Gates doesn’t give the lewdness of 2 Live Crew’s music a complete pass. “Much more troubling than its so-called obscenity is the group’s overt sexism,” he added, before asking that the listener put 2 Live Crew’s sexism into context, saying that it might cancel itself out because it is working in extreme hyperbole. But he also cautioned that “we must not allow ourselves to sentimentalize street culture: the appreciation of verbal virtuosity does not lessen one’s obligation to critique bigotry in all of its pernicious forms.”

The butt anthems delivered by 2 Live Crew, as well as “Baby Got Back,” “Rump Shaker,” and even LL Cool J’s “Big Ole Butt”—an earlier butt-themed single that didn’t climb as high on the charts—were not only musical experiences but visual ones. MTV was at the height of its influence in the late 1980s, and although hip-hop music had not originally been part of the station’s purview (they called themselves a rock station), Michael Jackson and Run-DMC had respectively broken the color and hip-hop line that had made MTV a de facto white station in its early years. In 1988, the channel began to broadcast *Yo! MTV Raps*, a countdown show that featured hip-hop videos. It performed extraordinarily well, jumping two Nielsen points in the first week and soon the

show was on every afternoon, playing the country's most popular hip-hop songs.

*Yo! MTV Raps* helped geographically disparate hip-hop artists hear and see one another's work and be in creative conversation with one another. The show also built the audience for hip-hop and became a vehicle for hip-hop style. As Snoop Dogg said in an interview for the book *MTV Uncensored*, "It put us on the same page as rock 'n' roll and music in general... it was a place where everybody could come, unite, everybody wanted to show their new videos." Rapper and VJ Ed Lover elaborated: "*Yo! MTV Raps* was responsible for bringing hip-hop to the masses. If you were from Compton, California, you could understand what was going on in New York and vice versa."

Because MTV had built its core audience in white suburbs across America, when *Yo! MTV Raps* became a hit, it also had the effect of exposing white audiences to hip-hop in a way that was unprecedented, a fact that made some parents anxious and contributed to lawsuits like the one against 2 Live Crew. Conservative groups feared that the frank sexuality, pervasive sexism, and perceived obscenity of hip-hop music and visual culture would corrupt white youth, concerns that were ostensibly based around sexual language and imagery but often had racial undertones. They were afraid Sir Mix-A-Lot might get exactly what he was after: that the jiggling Black butts in music videos might actually become appealing to white youth.

# JENNIFER



In 1998, mainstream America discovered Jennifer Lopez's butt. It was as if the white men of America had never seen an ass before or noticed that human women—their wives, perhaps, or mothers, or sisters—frequently have bulges and curves below the waist. Or maybe they had all been repressing their thoughts and feelings and finally, finally, they felt that they could speak.

Jennifer Lopez got her start in the entertainment industry in 1991, doing bounce grooves and splits as a Fly Girl with a voluminous mop of curly hair and a smear of mauve lipstick on the sketch comedy show *In Living Color*. It was a big break for the young dancer and actress, but Lopez's ambition was bigger. By the late nineties, she was trying to become a rare figure in American culture: the multimedia megastar. She wanted to be the lead in major Hollywood films as well as a platinum-selling recording artist—Julia Roberts and Mariah Carey in one. And she could—she would—do it. But first, she'd need to answer a lot of questions about her body.

It started in the Spanish-language media, when Lopez made her first star turn as Tejano superstar Selena Quintanilla in the 1997 film *Selena*. Quintanilla had been celebrated for her curves, her body representative of an ideal that many saw as emblematic of femininity in Latin and South America. There had been some controversy when director Gregory Nava cast Lopez, who is of Puerto Rican descent, in the role (Quintanilla was Mexican American, and fans and members of her community were protective of that distinction), but he justified the choice with an argument about body type. "If you're raised in this country, since childhood, you're given this image of beauty," he said. "And if you're *pocha*—Mexican American—it's not you. So you're made to feel bad about the way you



look or the way your body is, having big hips or whatever, from when you're a kid." As scholar Frances Negrón-Muntaner explained in her 1997 article "Jennifer's Butt," Lopez and Nava were expressing what they thought it meant to be Latina through the body and curves rather than political activism, language, geography, or class.

When *Selena* was released, Lopez approached questions about her own body with a smile, perhaps in an attempt to assuage concerns that she hadn't been right for the role. She often told stories about how the costume designers she worked with before *Selena* had tried to find ways to disguise her butt, when she wanted to celebrate it. "*Todo eso es tuyo?*" one interviewer asked her—"Is that all yours?" Lopez replied with glee, "*Todo eso mío*" ("It's all mine"). It would become a refrain throughout her career: *Is that butt real?* It was a question the press had asked Selena, too. In both cases, the star's butt seemed to be separate from her own body, an entity that needed special consideration.

In 1998, Lopez, and her butt, reached a broad new audience when she played Karen Sisco in Steven Soderbergh's film *Out of Sight*. The film was a big deal—Soderbergh's first box-office hit in nine years, since *Sex, Lies, and Videotape* had been released to critical acclaim and financial success in 1989. In *Out of Sight*, Lopez starred opposite George Clooney, an actor who had spent the previous four years playing heartthrob Doug Ross on *ER* and who had been recently named the sexiest man alive by *People* magazine. *Out of Sight* was a mainstream movie, and it had a wide release. To promote it, the stars made all the usual appearances on late-night talk shows and granted interviews with major magazines.

Like the Beckys in the intro to "Baby Got Back," interviewers who talked to and about Lopez seemed unable to help themselves. *It's just SO BIG!*, they seemed to say, their hand to their mouth, embarrassed and excited. But the press in 1997 didn't parrot the Beckys' other lines from "Baby Got Back"—when Jennifer Lopez's butt was acknowledged or interrogated, there wasn't a sense that it was considered gross or offensive. Instead, when she talked to men, there was a feeling of surprising acceptance and of barely disguised desire. *Premiere* declared "Jennifer Lopez's ass" to be the "feminine asset" that was currently "in" in Hollywood, replacing "Sharon Stone's crotch." *Saturday Night Live* had

guest star Lucy Lawless don an enormous false butt and impersonate Lopez in a sketch. Jay Leno twirled her onstage and encouraged the audience to ogle her backside. *Time* magazine ran an interview with Lopez that opened with the question “What’s the deal with your booty?” “It’s big,” she replied.

What else could she say? The question is a strange one and doesn’t so much demand an answer as reveal something about the person asking the question. “What’s the deal with your booty?” seems to beg the rejoinder: “What’s the deal with your interest in her booty? Why are you so obsessed?”

For the next twenty-five years, Lopez would be subjected to endless inquiries and innuendos about her butt. Magazines announced on their covers that they knew the secrets of her workout routine, and paparazzi scrambled to get both candid and red-carpet photos that captured as much of her behind as possible. In 2000, when she wore a revealing green jungle-print dress to the Grammys, Google programmers Huican Zhu and Susan Wojcicki invented the website’s image search to accommodate the sudden uptick in users trying to locate photographs of the dress, and the body within. For years, rumors swirled that she’d insured her butt (\$27 million is the figure quoted most often) and that hers was the titular “back” of Sir Mix-A-Lot’s anthem. In a 2016 “Carpool Karaoke” segment, she finally clarified to James Corden that the former was untrue—and that she wouldn’t even know how such insurance would work. In the beginning, Lopez laughed at the questions, refusing to be humiliated by them. Her butt, she made clear, was a natural part of her body, an attribute that made her distinct. In her “Jenny from the Block” video, she had her then boyfriend Ben Affleck literally kiss her ass, in a playful nod to the world’s obsession with it. Still, the narrative quickly became repetitive and reductive, especially as Lopez began to achieve that multimedia megastar level she’d been chasing. By the time she was on “Carpool Karaoke,” she seemed more exasperated than amused. *Are we really still talking about this?*

---

The butt obsession that accompanied Lopez’s rise to fame was a touchstone in a significant, decade-long transition in mainstream American culture. Though the

butt had to some extent “broken through” into wider attention and discourse via hip-hop and butt-oriented exercise regimes, in the early nineties, popular print and electronic media still rarely engaged with it in a straightforward way. They often relied on euphemisms like *derrière* and generally only talked about the butt as something to be hidden, trained, controlled.

But by the end of the 1990s, in the wake of Jennifer Lopez’s rise to fame, women’s butts had become a frequent part of the conversation in magazines like *Cosmopolitan* and *Seventeen*—publications whose business was to communicate to women what was normal and what was beautiful. By the early aughts, they were running articles asking “Are Butts the New Boobs?” and others with titles like “Bootylicious: Guys Talk Tail” that attempted to make sense of an apparent shift in the bodily ideal for women. In the years immediately following Jennifer Lopez’s crossover from *Selena* to Soderbergh and beyond, there would be an abundant new crop of popular songs about butts (with less public backlash), such as Sisqó’s “Thong Song” and “My Humps” by the Black Eyed Peas. Department stores even began to display mannequins with bigger butts.

It’s no coincidence that as this change was occurring, the United States was in the midst of a significant demographic shift: the country was in the process of becoming less white. In the 1990s, the population of Black people increased in the US by 15.6 percent, the population of Asians and Pacific Islanders increased by 46.3 percent, and the population of Hispanics (the designation used by the US census) increased by 57.9 percent. Although white people continued to outnumber all other racial categories by a significant margin, the percentage of people of color was growing, a trend that would continue through 2010 and is projected to continue through at least 2050, when statisticians predict that the Hispanic population will make up 30 percent of the population of the United States and white people will become a minority. As a consequence of these changes, the very definition of mainstream American culture had been thrown into question.

“Mainstream” has always been a slippery concept. To be mainstream is to *not* be alternative, eccentric, subcultural, deviant, or an outsider. It is a center defined by its periphery, a term that feels clear but actually isn’t at all. Sometimes

*mainstream* is a euphemism for *white*, sometimes a synonym for *popular* or *square* or *highly consumed*. Often, it's all of these things at once.

The changing demography of the United States certainly didn't lead to a widespread embrace of all facets of nonwhite culture, but it did mean that corporate America became increasingly interested in targeting the growing population of nonwhite consumers. In Hollywood, the financial successes of films like *House Party*, *Boyz n the Hood*, and later *Waiting to Exhale* proved to entertainment executives that Black audiences could and would turn out in large numbers for stories that represented people like them. "The black population is younger, and is growing faster than other segments of the U.S. population, other than Latinos," Ken Smikle, the publisher of *Target Market News*, a Chicago-based publication that tracked Black consumer patterns, told the *New York Times* in 1991. "So our future numbers look even better to studios, because young people buy the bulk of movie tickets." Black characters on television also multiplied in the 1990s—reaching nearly 17 percent—particularly in the early years of the decade when shows like *The Fresh Prince of Bel-Air* and *Hangin' with Mr. Cooper* aired in prime time (even if, as studies have shown, the female Black and Latinx characters often played into long-held stereotypes of hypersexuality and underachievement). As the decade progressed, that number diminished, hovering between 10 and 14 percent for the last half of the 1990s, though it remained a significant percentage and one that paralleled the actual Black population of the United States. Hollywood had a more difficult time targeting Latino audiences, a tremendously diverse ethnic group that, according to market research, was less likely than Black audiences to see a film primarily because of a star's racial identity. In the 2000s, after the census revealed just how much the US Latino population was growing, major corporations increased their efforts to target this demographic group, as well as other ethnic minorities. General Mills, Tide, and Honda all produced ads targeting Latinos, and McDonald's and Adidas created advertising campaigns that targeted Black audiences, as well as the increasing number of white people interested in hip-hop culture.

Although these demographic shifts were changing the face of mainstream America, there was another, simultaneous shift occurring that would have a

profound effect on body ideals over the next thirty years: white audiences were ravenously consuming hip-hop music, fashion, and culture. Research from 2000 suggests that as much as 70 percent of consumers of rap and hip-hop records in the late 1990s were white. Some scholars, including noted hip-hop feminist Tricia Rose, have argued that those numbers don't take into account bootleg music and music shared among friends, strategies of consumption that were popular in Black communities, a fact that might skew the numbers. But it is undoubtedly true that white audiences were an essential component of hip-hop's rise to dominance in popular music, and that hip-hop was increasingly important and interesting to young, white men in particular.

But why were young white men so interested in engaging with a culture that seemingly had so little to do with most of their lives? Hip-hop had its origins in the Bronx and spread across the United States as a cultural form that expressed the angst, rage, joy, and politics of the Black and Latinx experience in a country that had systematically oppressed these groups for centuries. This was a history and experience that the white people buying up to 70 percent of hip-hop records weren't typically a part of.

In 2000, *MTV News* correspondent Chris Connelly offered a succinct answer: "When they write the history of popular culture in the 20th century, they can sum it up in one sentence, which is: 'White kids wanting to be as cool as Black kids.'" In 2019, Wesley Morris expressed it a different way when writing about white interest in Black music: "This is the music of a people who have survived, who not only won't stop but also can't be stopped... music whose promise and possibility, whose rawness, humor and carnality call out to everybody—to other black people, to kids in working class England and middle-class Indonesia. If freedom's ringing, who on Earth wouldn't also want to rock the bell?"

---

Since the Jazz Age, the phenomenon of young white people being drawn in droves to Black cultural products, particularly Black music, as well as the patina of coolness and authenticity those cultural products seemed to provide, had

been a constant in American life. In the eighties and nineties, hip-hop assumed the mantle as the latest in a string of popular musical forms—following the jazz, blues, rock 'n' roll, soul, and funk of previous generations—that originated in Black communities and were then embraced with great and often predatory enthusiasm by eager white people. Of course, it is not only Black culture that is routinely appropriated by dominant groups in the United States, although the appropriation of Black culture by white people has been foundational to American popular culture and music. This same appropriative gesture—taking the parts of a culture that feel thrilling, subversive, or sexual without any acknowledgment of the broader cultural, political, or sociological context—happens with nearly every nonwhite culture, including Indigenous, Japanese, Indian, and many, many others.

But just what is it that white people are looking for when they “play in the dark,” as Toni Morrison once characterized this type of idolatry and mimicry? Perhaps the most straightforward, and commonly given, answer to that question is that white people desire a sense of cultural identity. For many white people, whiteness itself does not provide a structuring force of selfhood, because most white people generally don't see whiteness as anything at all. It is the norm, the middle, the thing against which everything else forms—the mainstream. Whiteness is neutral, so boring and so normal that it cannot be a quality that generates identity, and it cannot offer the kind of distinction, individuation, or rebelliousness that many young people seek as they separate from their families and parents in adolescence and beyond.

And for those who do conceive of whiteness as an identity, it is often an uncomfortable one. It is the identity of the oppressor. Whiteness seems, by its history and perhaps very nature, cruel. Because whiteness, like Blackness, is a specious category—one constructed for no reason other than to create and maintain a racial hierarchy—to identify as white is to admit complicity in that construction. And so, for those uncomfortable with their whiteness, it is tempting to look to other cultures for a sense of identity and belonging.

In his crucial book on the topic of cultural appropriation, *Love and Theft*, scholar Eric Lott investigates this behavior through an examination of minstrel shows, the immensely popular nineteenth-and-early-twentieth-century

performances where white people performed stereotypes of Blackness in blackface. Minstrel shows have long been seen as one of the primordial moments—and often the most vivid enactment—of the kind of appropriative gesture that has proved to be such a lasting part of American popular culture. According to Lott, the audiences at minstrel shows—mostly working-class white people in large urban centers like New York City—were doing two things at once: identifying with a rebellious, libidinal stereotype of Blackness and feeling superior, flattered, and assuaged by hateful stereotypes that cast Black people as stupid and childlike. The shows were a way for white people to see themselves as adjacent to the parts of Blackness that they saw as exciting and freeing, while simultaneously reinforcing their own whiteness. They could, as Morrison says, “play in the dark,” but they would never remain there. They would always return to their own position as separate, and superior to, Black people.

For Lott and many other cultural historians, this doubleness is always at work when white people become interested in adopting and interpreting Black cultural forms. When Elvis played “That’s All Right,” a song written by Black blues singer Arthur “Big Boy” Crudup, white audiences interpreted him as rebellious, free, and sexy. But they never saw him as Black. Not only was his whiteness never in question, it was actually reinforced by the way he situated himself in relation to Blackness. He smuggled in the excitement, danger, and eroticism commonly associated with Blackness but kept it safely packaged in familiar, nonthreatening whiteness—his fans could have their cake and eat it, too. The “thrills” of Blackness, without the fear or guilt.

The appropriation of hip-hop by white people in the nineties, however, seemed to operate differently than it had with rock ’n’ roll (or blues, or jazz, etc.). Although the Beastie Boys were a huge success, most white rappers, such as Vanilla Ice and Marky Mark, had little staying power compared to Black artists like Jay-Z and the Wu-Tang Clan. Unlike the generations before them, white teenagers in the nineties directed their interest and their dollars toward the Black performers who exuded (or appeared to exude) authenticity, resulting in a cultural consumption pattern Cornel West called “the Afro-Americanization of white youth.” Beyond just absorbing the music, white kids fashioned themselves to look like and sound like the hip-hop stars they idolized on MTV, adopting

distinctly urban Black American idioms and visual codes in an effort to be cool, to create identity, and, as Wesley Morris suggests, to be adjacent to the feeling of freedom, joy, rawness, and humor that had always been part of Black music. And for white men, specifically, hip-hop offered a way to grapple with masculinity. As cultural critic Greg Tate put it in his 2003 book *Everything but the Burden*, “[African American musical forms] have become the theme musics of a young, white, middle-class male majority—due largely to that demographic’s investment in the tragic-magical displays of virility exhibited by America’s ultimate outsider, the Black male.”

Along with this larger adoption of hip-hop culture, cultural historian Janell Hobson explains, came a deep appreciation for and attention to women’s butts. Butts, according to Hobson, have always been an important element of African American vernacular dance, and this is one of the major reasons that they have become a focus of African American beauty ideals and are prominently featured in the aesthetics of hip-hop. “In Black cultures, in terms of our dance expressions,” she explains, “we tend to do more hip-shaking, booty-shaking kind of dances, and that definitely redirects the gaze.” Although Hobson sees echoes of Sarah Baartman’s display and white people’s obsession with her body, she notes a crucial difference between interest in Baartman in Georgian London and white interest in hip-hop and the butt in the 1990s. “What we see in terms of the preference for big butts,” she says, “that’s coming from Black male desire. Straight-up, point-blank. It’s only through Black males and their gaze that white men are starting to take notice.”

But what, then, can be made of the frenzied focus on Jennifer Lopez’s butt? She is not a Black woman, but rather a Puerto Rican woman who, at the time of her crossover success, was playing racially ambiguous roles (her race isn’t mentioned in *Out of Sight*, and Italian American actor Dennis Farina plays her father). There is no doubt that the press understood her as Latina—she had come to fame dancing on a hip-hop television show and played a Tejano music icon, and many journalists who wrote about *Out of Sight* acknowledged her ethnicity. Her ethnic identity was often provided as a handy explanation for why she had, and enjoyed having, a large butt. But some, like journalist Teresa Wiltz, wondered if the fact that she was light skinned was an essential part of the



mainstream acceptance of her body, something that had allowed white people to feel comfortable enough to express their desire. “Perhaps,” she posited in a 1998 article, “her racially nebulous features, her cafe au lait complexion with an extra helping of cream, make her palatable to the masses.”

Desire is, of course, complex, and it is perhaps too simple to say that white men writ large began to desire women with big butts—or openly admit to that desire—because they were consuming and absorbing hip-hop culture. Desire is both a societal force and an individual experience, something that is shaped by the world around us and idiosyncratic within each one of us. But it is undoubtedly true that the culture we consume can form what we see as desirable, and also grant us permission to access and express desires that have previously gone unacknowledged or unexplored. Whether this large-scale consumption of hip-hop in the late 1990s and early 2000s created a desire or unleashed it, the way women’s butts were situated with respect to white male desire was undergoing a major transformation.

# KIM



The story that Beyoncé Knowles often tells about the 2001 Destiny's Child hit “Bootylicious” is that, when she wrote the lyrics, the press had been giving her a hard time about her recent weight gain, and she wanted to push back. “I wrote that song because I was getting bigger and bigger and I just wanted to talk about it,” Knowles told *Newsweek* in 2002. “I like to eat and that’s a problem in this industry. I’m still probably twice as big as any of the other actresses out there, and that’s a constant grind that I really hate to have to worry about.”

The idea that Beyoncé was, in any sense, “big” is illustrative of the contradictions around body image in the late 1990s and 2000s. Although in the years following Jennifer Lopez’s rise to fame there was a growing enthusiasm for “curves” in the media, this change was not so much a wholesale embrace of the vast spectrum of human morphology as it was a new way to scrutinize women’s bodies. Just as corsets had been replaced with cabbage diets in the 1920s, the newfound enthusiasm for larger, more shapely butts in the late 1990s certainly did not mean that women were suddenly free from pressures around diet, weight, or fitness. Instead, gossip magazines continued to give Beyoncé—a woman who was unquestionably thin—a hard time about eating too many french fries.

“Bootylicious” was the second single off Destiny’s Child’s third album, *Survivor*, and reached number one on the *Billboard* Hot 100. The album was generally well reviewed and publicly embraced, in part for its celebration of curvier shapes and sizes. But it was also criticized for mixing what was referred to in articles as “G-rated fun” with an adult sexuality that might negatively influence younger fans. This gripe overlooked the album’s determination to

showcase women who were both sexy and in control, invoking a new brand of early-aughts feminism.

“Bootylicious” was a prime example: the song is written from the perspective of a woman out at a club, in the process of seducing (presumably) a man. The woman doubts he can handle just how sexy and confident she is—and it is her booty, her jelly, that is the source (or at least a source) of her power. “I don’t think you’re ready for this jelly,” she sings, “...’cause my body too bootylicious for ya, babe.” It will take quite a man to handle the awesomeness of what she has to offer, and tonight’s contender might not be up to the task.

In the years since the release of “Bootylicious,” many have lauded it as a body-positive feminist anthem. It seems to be saying: *I love and respect myself how I am, and there is no doubt in my mind that you should love and respect me, too, or at least find me sexy. The thing that some might find shameful—my jelly, my booty—I forthrightly proclaim to be my most significant asset and a source of pride.*

And yet, there actually wasn’t that much jelly in the video, or so some critics pointed out. There are a few larger dancers in the video’s intro and then scattered throughout, but the women of Destiny’s Child are thin, even if they do have and clearly draw attention to their shapely butts. But, to some extent, that may be the point. Even Beyoncé, whose body did not deviate radically from the ideals of the time, was ridiculed by the press. So stringent and narrow were expectations that there seemed to be no way a human woman could ever be free from criticism about her body. And so Beyoncé offered a novel, exuberant response: she celebrates those parts of her that have been deemed incorrect and unruly, and declares them to be sexy.

But an embrace of curves wasn’t the only thing communicated about Black women’s bodies in the video. Several of the costumes referenced the attire of pimps and sex workers from the 1970s, which, as scholar Aisha Durham points out, is a pattern in many of Destiny’s Child’s other songs and videos—“Nasty Girl,” for example, traffics in the idea that big-butt Black women are typically lower class and sexually promiscuous. Not all butts, it seemed, were empowered.

For the past twenty years, scholars and journalists have debated whether or not Beyoncé is truly a feminist, and, if so, what kind. Is she complicit in the objectification of women or is she complicating that objectification? Is she

asserting agency over her sexuality and celebrating her body or is she “offering her body up as commodity fetish,” as one scholar put it? Is she subverting the patriarchy or, as bell hooks suggested in 2016, staying “within a conventional stereotypical framework” of Black femininity? In 2001, these conversations were in their nascent stages, and “Bootylicious” and its video were central to them. Like Sir Mix-A-Lot, Destiny’s Child celebrated butts and curves, but “Bootylicious,” unlike “Baby Got Back,” was performed and created by the possessors of the butts under discussion—a group of Black women who wrote the music, owned the songs, and had control over their image, including the clothes they wore, which were primarily designed by Beyoncé’s mother, Tina Lawson. Like Jennifer Lopez, they were proud of their bodies, but they were actively driving the conversation around them, rather than slogging through endless questions by titillated and scandalized journalists. Granted, it’s perhaps an anemic kind of feminism that is situated mostly in the realm of beauty and sex—moving the needle only in terms of how much fat is acceptable and attractive on a woman’s body isn’t exactly upending the patriarchy—but it was something.

Much of the media attention around the song focused on the word *bootylicious* itself. What exactly did it mean? The term *bootylicious* first appeared in a song in 1992, when Snoop Dogg used it pejoratively, but it caught fire after Destiny’s Child’s single was released. It wasn’t necessarily, or exclusively, a reference to the butt, but instead something more broadly, and vaguely, empowering. After all, *booty* means both the butt specifically and sex in general, and so the word could be about *the* booty or about a person’s capacity to *get* booty. In 2003, when Oprah asked her to define it, Beyoncé said she thought it meant “beautiful, bountiful, and bounceable,” a definition that was pleasantly alliterative but did little to clarify the issue. The following year, it was added to *The Oxford English Dictionary*, defined as “esp. of a woman, often with reference to the buttocks: sexually attractive, sexy; shapely.” Via this “official” designation, a positive meaning around the butt was documented for the present and future masses: it was a desirable thing to have shapely buttocks. The word sounded far more fun, and far less pretentious, than its older counterpart *callipygian*, and the fact that the word had become widespread enough to find

its way into the august and hardly cutting-edge *OED* suggested a meaningful shift: bootylicious—the song, the word, and the concept—was becoming a cultural force.

---

While bootyliciousness marked a sort of progress, the 2000s remained by and large a period of extreme fat anxiety within the popular media. The same programs and magazines celebrating curves and offering new ways to create just the right amount of butt cleavage in low-rise jeans were simultaneously encouraging liposuction and endlessly printing retouched images of impossibly thin celebrities. Alicia Silverstone and Drew Barrymore—as well as Beyoncé—were consistently ridiculed for being fat, even though they were thinner by far than most American women, and at the same time paparazzi photos made hefty sums catching them (and many others) in moments when they looked less than red-carpet ready. The fashion industry had moved on from the quasi-bohemian, waifish look popularized by Kate Moss but continued to glorify extremely thin bodies, including those of Calista Flockhart, Jennifer Aniston, Jennifer Love Hewitt, and the cast of *Sex and the City*. Runway models became so consistently, unnervingly thin in the 2000s that several European countries passed laws banning the hiring of models under a certain weight. But the fashion world embraced digital photo-editing technologies like Photoshop to make sure their models appeared adequately emaciated in print, if they couldn't be in life. It was a practice that was near universal, and would come to define media and beauty standards for years to come.

Although she wasn't a model (or at least she wasn't *only* a model), heiress Paris Hilton, slight in body but ravenous in her desire for attention, came to typify this other, non-bootylicious brand of early-aughts sexiness. Born into the Hilton hotel fortune, she was white and she was sassy, and she had protruding hip bones; a performative, high-octave, sexy baby voice; and an aggressively conventional, California-blond presentation that felt like a throwback to eighties, pre-grunge style. Hilton's rise to fame came in part due to famous friends and a graphic sex tape that an ex-boyfriend released to the media and

then to home video, which quickly became a media sensation and sold extremely well. She was, as was often said at the time, “famous for being famous,” the prototype for a new kind of celebrity, widely photographed by the tabloids as she shopped Rodeo Drive and enjoyed bottle service at the Viper Room. In 2003, she brought her personal brand of faux-naivete into living rooms across America with the reality show *The Simple Life*, which documented the adventures of Hilton and fellow celebrity offspring Nicole Richie as they abandoned their gilded existences to live and work with families in rural America. She was ridiculous in many ways—somehow she managed to trademark the phrase “That’s hot”—but she was also living a life coveted by many, and doing so in a body envied by many women. If Moss aestheticized poverty and addiction, Hilton’s look physicalized bottomless, unearned wealth.

Ironically, it was via the rise of Paris Hilton—and her inner circle—that one of the most famous and culturally influential butts of the modern celebrity era emerged. Kim Kardashian was, at first, a minor member of Paris Hilton’s entourage of wealthy, chaotic women, which also included Britney Spears and Lindsay Lohan. Like Hilton, she came from great privilege: she grew up down the street from the Beverly Hills Hotel in a mansion with a Bentley in the driveway. Her fourteenth birthday party was hosted by Michael Jackson at Neverland Ranch.

Kardashian’s father, Robert, was a successful attorney and businessman, now perhaps best known for being one of O. J. Simpson’s closest friends and a member of his legal team during his infamous 1995 murder trial. He was also Armenian, an ethnic category that had been legally declared white by the Supreme Court following a 1925 immigration case. However, due to a long history of discrimination, both abroad and within the United States, many Armenian Americans do not identify as white today. Throughout her career, Kardashian would use her mixed-race identity (Kim’s mother, Kris Jenner, is white) to situate herself as both white and nonwhite at the same time, enjoying the privileges of whiteness and strategically setting herself outside of whiteness when it suited her, pointing to her Armenian heritage as the reason for her so-called exotic or vixen looks: her dark hair, olive skin, and, of course, large butt.

In the 1990s, Robert Kardashian and Kris Jenner divorced after having four children—Kim, her sisters Kourtney and Khloe, and her brother, Robert Jr. Kris Jenner then married Olympic champion decathlete Caitlyn Jenner, who also had four kids from previous marriages. The couple went on to have two children of their own and to raise the whole brood together in a massive mansion in Calabasas, an affluent suburb of Los Angeles.

Kim Kardashian and Paris Hilton had been friends since they were little girls. In the early 2000s, Kardashian started working as Hilton's personal stylist, dressing her in purple velour sweatsuits and Louis Vuitton bags. But Kardashian was more Hilton's sorority sister than her employee, and they spent much of the early 2000s posing together for tabloid photographers on Australian beaches and outside of LA nightclubs, creating a compelling visual contrast—the stick-thin, bleached-blond superstar and the curvy, dark-haired sidekick.

Soon, though, Kardashian herself began to find her way into the headlines. In March 2007 (in what many speculated was an *All About Eve*-esque power play), Vivid Entertainment released a homemade, forty-one-minute video depicting Kardashian having sex and “goofing around” (as Page Six later put it) with her ex-boyfriend Ray J, the singer, actor, and younger brother of R & B star Brandy. Like Hilton before her, Kardashian's private erotic escapades made for endless tabloid fodder, and her newfound, ostensibly accidental celebrity helped thrust nearly her entire family into the spotlight.

In Kim's first scene of the first episode of *Keeping Up with the Kardashians*, the E! reality TV show that premiered just a few months after the release of the Kim and Ray J sex tape, Kris Jenner teases her daughter about the size of her butt. “She's got a little junk in the trunk,” Jenner remarks snarkily as Kim heads to the fridge for a snack. “She could use a little cardio!” It was a fateful way to inaugurate what was to become one of the most popular reality shows to ever air on television. In the first season, the family spends a tremendous amount of time contending with the release of and fallout from Kim's sex tape, which her mother/manager (*momager* was Kris Jenner's preferred title) views as both a personal disappointment and a professional opportunity. After much hemming and hawing, Kim eventually agrees to capitalize on the moment and pose for a nude photo spread in *Playboy*.

The show was quickly picked up for a second season (it would go on to air a total of twenty) and was the number one show in its time slot for women eighteen to thirty-four, a coveted demographic for advertisers. Kardashian was propelled to a new level of fame: she was the most googled person in 2008 and became a fixture in tabloids, where her butt was nearly always mentioned. When she joined the cast of *Dancing with the Stars* in 2008, *OK!* magazine reassured their readers that her training wouldn't affect her shape. "Make no butts about it," the tabloid reported, "Kim plans to keep those curves." *Cosmopolitan* described her as an entrepreneur and asked, "So what if she's made bank off her butt?" She regularly denied persistent rumors that she padded her butt or had implants (she would eventually go so far as to have her butt X-rayed on an episode of *KUWTK* to prove she hadn't). In general, media stories about Kardashian seemed to suggest that her big butt was a good thing, something to be desired, although some weren't so sure; "It's a badonka-don't!" declared *Us Weekly* in 2008. In April 2008, Paris Hilton weighed in, calling in to a Las Vegas morning radio show and making it clear that she wouldn't want to have a butt like Kim's. To her, it looked like "cottage cheese stuffed in a trash bag." In 2009, Kardashian spoke to *News of the World* about the exposure and debate, echoing (intentionally or not) the words of Jennifer Lopez from a decade earlier: "There's constant interest in my bottom! The paparazzi always want 'butt' shots; girls come up to me and grab it and people ask to squeeze it. I sometimes think: 'Everyone's got a butt, why do you care about mine?'"

It was a valid question, with more than one answer. To some extent, Kardashian's body was garnering attention due to the larger cultural moment, one marked by increasing and long-overdue calls for body positivity following decades of body shaming in popular media. The push for more realistic and healthy representations of women's bodies took a number of forms, including a campaign by trade groups in the UK and the United States to limit how much magazines could digitally alter a model's appearance, as well as an effort by France's National Assembly to criminalize the promotion of "excessive thinness." In 2006, model and talk show host Tyra Banks, sick of reading cruel, punny headlines about her body—such as "Thigh-ra Banks," "America's Next Top Waddle," and "Tyra Porkchops"—dedicated an episode of her popular



daytime show to defiantly addressing her critics: “I have something to say to all of you that have something nasty to say about me or other women who are built like me. Women whose names you know, women whose names you don’t, women who’ve been picked on, women whose husbands put them down, women at work or girls in school. I have one thing to say to you: Kiss my fat ass.” She appeared on the cover of *People* magazine the next month under the defiant headline “You Call This Fat?”

The Kardashians were clever in how they navigated this growing cultural conversation. They weren’t exactly radical in their body positivity—there was near constant emphasis on maintaining or modifying their looks in the show—but they also weren’t stick thin, often portraying themselves as struggling with their weight and bodies in relatable ways, or as relatable as incredibly wealthy and famous people can be. Kim often spoke on *KUWTK* about wanting to change the way her body looked, but also about her enjoyment of sweets and hatred of exercise. Even as the Kardashian sisters were shown constantly eating salads—to the point where their salad consumption was turned into a popular meme—they also prominently displayed cookies in glass jars on their kitchen counters, implying a willingness to indulge. In one 2009 *Cosmopolitan* profile of Kim, the writer said Kim was out of breath after a long hike and described her as “digging into dessert—crepes with strawberries, bananas, and whipped cream.” These behaviors, according to the article, contributed to her appeal: “Sure, men think she’s hot. But women think of her as a refreshingly real alternative to skeletal fame-bots.”

Another reason everyone seemed to care so much about Kim’s butt was that *she* never stopped talking about it, displaying it, and capitalizing on it. The entire Kardashian family, but primarily Kim, created a cottage industry out of promoting their shapes. In the two-minute trailer for her 2009 workout video series *Fit in Your Jeans by Friday*, she mentions her butt or her curves ten times. (Never mind that her butt, she continued to claim, was a product of nature, not surgery or exercise.) The family talked about butts and bodies constantly on their reality show, and when, in 2010, Kim released her first perfume—imaginatively named “Kim Kardashian”—its tagline was “a voluptuous new scent.”

And then, in 2012, Kim signed up for Instagram, a space where she immediately found a large audience, and one that has continued to grow—as of 2021, she is the sixth-most-followed person, ahead of both Beyoncé and Jennifer Lopez (three of her sisters occupy spots in the top twelve). The social media platform, launched in 2010, offered a simulacrum of truth similar to that of reality television, as well as a digital space for Kardashian to interact directly with her fans, inviting a quasi-participatory intimacy in a life that many already knew well from five seasons of *KUWTK*. Instagram turned out to be the ideal place for Kardashian to show off—and monetize—the part of her body for which she'd become so well-known. Instagram's community guidelines banned nudity in photos posted on the app, but, until 2015, the guidelines about butt cheeks were vague. This gave users relatively free rein to post nude or nearly nude images of butts and meant that the most explicit sexual images on Instagram were butt shots. Although Kardashian didn't post fully nude images of her butt, she often posted revealing pictures of herself in a skimpy bikini or a tight dress, striking a pose that would become one of her signatures: butt and back to the camera, with Kim peeking over her shoulder, a position reminiscent of the *Venus Callipyge*. Those posts received tens of thousands of likes (a good result in 2012), which in turn made them appear more often in subscribers' feeds, thanks to an algorithm designed to promote popular posts and boost imagery with similar content. It was a feedback loop: the popularity of her butt made her butt—and butts in general—more popular on the site. And, because Kardashian used Instagram as a platform to promote her brand, the popularity of her butt made both Kardashian and Instagram a fortune.

By the mid-2010s, the Kardashian sisters were using more and more extreme means to fashion and mold their looks, including lip fillers and waist trainers, and were suspected of utilizing surgical enhancements to maintain and create the sorts of voluptuous figures that they helped popularize (something they regularly denied). After promoting a certain look—whether it was a tiny waist or a bee-stung lip—they would then introduce Kardashian-branded products that promised to help women achieve a similar result through makeup, body care, and shapewear. The Kardashians set the trend and flooded the market, using their faces and bodies as their own best advertisements.

The mania for Kim Kardashian's butt only increased in subsequent years, reaching a new peak in November 2014, when she appeared on the cover of *Paper* magazine. The photographs for the cover and inside spread were taken by the French photographer Jean-Paul Goude, who had famously worked with Jamaican model, musician, and actress Grace Jones in the 1970s, and who had been regularly criticized for objectifying and reinforcing stereotypes of Black women's bodies. The magazine, and accompanying online article, promised to "break the internet" via provocative images of Kardashian and her butt: in one, a clothed Kardashian stands in profile with a champagne glass balancing on her butt and a rainbow of champagne cascading up and over her head to fill it. In another, Kardashian stands nude, her butt facing the camera, her skin shellacked in a lustrous glaze, as she peeks over her shoulder.

*Paper* got what it was asking for: the day after its publication, the article accounted for 1 percent of all online web traffic in the United States, and the images stirred up a huge amount of controversy. The image of Kardashian in profile, in particular, reminded many commentators of the posters and legacy of Sarah Baartman from 1810. It was, in some ways, a strange comparison: although Kardashian's big-butt silhouette did echo Baartman's, her circumstances and personal history could not have been more different. It was this distance that rendered the image uncomfortable—here was a privileged non-Black woman using her butt to play in Blackness, breaking the internet (and the bank) in the process.

It was hardly the only time that Kim made aesthetic choices that smacked of appropriation, or worse: in 2018, and again in 2020, she wore Fulani braids, calling them "Bo Derek" braids. In 2017, she was accused of wearing blackface thanks to skin-darkening makeup. In 2019, she named her shapewear line Kimono (with no apparent regard for the fact that a kimono is a traditional Japanese garment) before changing it to Skims because of the backlash. It seemed that a part of Kardashian's brand was provocative racial performance, and although she was often called out, and occasionally made a change so as to "not offend anyone," she never offered a meaningful apology or experienced a professional reckoning. Instead, the Kardashians implicitly and explicitly justified their constant use of Black aesthetics to create and maintain their brand.

Some have even suggested that the Kardashian sisters' friendships with Black women and relationships with Black men (and interracial children) usefully provided what critic Allison P. Davis called a "cultural cover for their appropriation."

In a way, twenty years after the release of "Baby Got Back," Sir Mix-A-Lot's dream had come true: big butts were more visible and openly desired than they had ever been. But Kim Kardashian proved that any progress was extremely limited: a world where sex symbols are known primarily for their big butts did not prove to be a place where all bodies were accepted, and it certainly wasn't a place where Black women could find greater power or appreciation, or even the opportunity to become beauty icons themselves. Instead, the most famous big-butted woman in the world was an extremely wealthy woman who wasn't quite white but also was very much not Black, a set of facts that she would use to her advantage. Over the next ten years, Kardashian would continue to use her butt to regularly, and unabashedly, appropriate elements of Black culture, and continue to make a huge amount of money while doing it. And she wouldn't be the only one.

---

# Motion

---

# TWERK



If you search YouTube for instructional videos on how to twerk, you'll find millions of results: there are routines filmed by amateurs on phones in bedrooms and apartment hallways; there are videos with decent production values and backup dancers released by dance studios; there are a number in Russian and other Eastern European languages; and there is one in which three professional ballerinas learn the moves ("start in second position," their instructor begins). Some of the best tutorials, though, are the work of Big Freedia, an artist and self-identified queen diva who has been central to the world of twerk and bounce (the musical form most associated with twerking) for more than two decades. In *How to Bounce Like the Queen of New Orleans*, which promises twerk instruction for beginners, Freedia stands tall, with long black hair and a full face of tasteful makeup, wearing green stretchy pants, a colorful striped shirt, and black sneakers. Two students stand just behind her, dressed in long black pants and black T-shirts, ready to learn some of the essential moves of the form: "exercise," "rock the boat," and "mixing." She begins with a simple piece of advice for novices: "If your booty ain't movin', you ain't doing it right!"

After the students have tried out the first two techniques—which both require placing one's feet at a forty-five-degree angle, bending over, and rocking the hips from side to side at increasing speed—Freedia transitions into mixing, which she describes as moving "like a mixing bowl—your butt goes round and round." It's all in the hips and back; the feet don't move at all. Freedia shows her students how to perform each of the techniques bent over, with their hands against a wall, or with their arms in the air. Although these gestures are undeniably sexy, in the video they read as more joyful than seductive. As hips

shake side to side and butts begin to bounce, smiles appear on the students' faces.

Freedia, who identifies as a gay man and uses all pronouns, has been twerking and performing and dancing to bounce music since the 1990s, helping to popularize the dance over the last decade through “twerkshops,” a TV show, and videos like *How to Bounce Like the Queen*. But Big Freedia isn't only a twerk evangelist, she's also an educator, dispensing information about the history of bounce and the roots of twerk as part of a mission to correct misunderstandings and misinterpretations that have emerged over the last decade about what twerk is, what it means, and where it comes from. Freedia's work makes it clear that the popular version of twerk often neglects the history of the dance, which has always been associated with resistance, joy, and, yes, sex, but is often presented as something trendy, more overtly sexual, and less complex.

---

In order to understand twerk, you need to know about Congo Square. Located in an open, inviting area in the Tremé neighborhood of New Orleans, Congo Square is a large, tree-lined space paved with cobblestones arranged in concentric circles and dotted with bronze statues. The statues—which depict second-line parades, Mardi Gras Indians, and women dancing—are monuments to what is perhaps the most important three acres in the cultural history of the United States.

Even before the arrival of Europeans, the land that would become Congo Square was a ceremonial ground for the Muscogee, a place where Indigenous people gathered to dance and sing. By the eighteenth century, New Orleans had become a port city, a gateway to the Caribbean and a crucial geographical anchor in the transatlantic slave trade. The French had colonized Louisiana and brought the institution of slavery with them. They also brought a set of laws called the Code Noir that regulated enslaved people, which consisted of fifty-five articles that made Roman Catholicism compulsory, regulated marriage and ownership of children, and codified allowable punishment. Because of the Roman Catholic requirement, the code also mandated that slave owners provide enslaved people

with a day of rest on Sundays. Consequently, it was on Sundays when Congo Square became an epicenter for the creation, celebration, and mixing of Black, Caribbean, and Indigenous cultural forms. It was the place where the drum kit was first assembled, and where music and dance from across the African diaspora had the space to thrive and evolve into new, unique forms such as jazz, second lines, and eventually, twerk. Wynton Marsalis once declared that “every strand of American music comes directly from Congo Square.”

In the eighteenth century, the square was festive, vibrant, and loud. The dancers wore feathers, bells, shells, and pelts and moved to the music of marimbas, flutes, banjos, and violins. Women faced away from the audience and shook their butts side to side, in a dance likely inspired by the mapouka, a celebratory festival dance from the Côte d’Ivoire that was colloquially known as *la danse du fessier*: the dance of the behind. The dance was part of a spiritual practice, a way to encounter and celebrate God. They also danced the bamboula, a frantic feat of endurance accompanied by banjos and drums, and the calinda, a combination dance and martial art that made graceful use of a long stick, and a hybrid call-and-response form called the Congo, an inspiration for many contemporary forms.

The gatherings, as one might expect, soon became a concern for the city’s ruling white population. Congo Square represented not only the continuation of cultural identities colonialism had tried to suppress, but also the power of a community structure and bond. If enslaved people could come together to dance, they could also come together to revolt, even beyond New Orleans. These types of dances and celebrations, after all, happened not only in Congo Square—they were part of an artistic resistance across the colonies, pushing back against European notions of meekness and modesty. According to scholar Elizabeth Pérez, “The authorities intuited what many scholars now argue: that bodies remember.” In both their overt African identity and their overt sensuality, butt-oriented dances were a form of defiance against slave owners and the culture they represented, a defiance that would remain a part of such dancing through the centuries.

In 1817, the city government of New Orleans—which had by this time become a part of the United States—enforced new restrictions mandating that



gatherings of enslaved people could take place only in the square, and only on Sunday afternoons. As slave laws in the United States became increasingly strict and draconian, the gatherings at Congo Square withered and died, only to gradually be resurrected over a century later, in the 1910s and '20s.

In the beginning of the twentieth century, Mardi Gras was the most important day of the year in New Orleans, marked by raucous parades attended by costumed revelers flowing throughout the city. According to Kim Marie Vaz, professor of education at Xavier University of Louisiana, this tradition of dress-up, or masking, offered the Black people of New Orleans a way to transgress the social order, forge a collective identity, and assert their humanity in the face of constant persecution and marginalization and persistent, dire poverty.

Most of those who donned costumes, however, were men, most notably New Orleans Black Indians who wore feathered headdresses and other Indigenous clothing. Women, and specifically those who worked in brothels and dance halls, however, were excluded from masking, because of their gender and occupation. Tired of being left out, in the 1910s a group of these women, who called themselves the Baby Dolls, decided to join second-line parades, wearing short dresses, frilly shorts, bonnets, bloomers, and parasols. It was a performance at once childlike and sexy, and was one possible inspiration for Josephine Baker's contemporaneous performances in Paris. The Baby Dolls wore dresses far shorter than was considered acceptable at the time, and in the parades, they danced popular and provocative dances, like the shimmy, the shake, and bucking, all of which put their butts at the center of the action. Merline Kimble, a granddaughter of a Baby Doll, later confirmed that the dancing "was an activist thing," describing the clothing choices and insistence on "having a ball" as a rebellion against "what was put on women during the time."

Another thread in the evolution of twerk comes from Jamaica in the years after World War II, when reggae began to evolve rapidly, ultimately sprouting new forms such as dub, and from dub, dancehall. Each of those genres utilized enormous sound systems assembled by DJs in the dance halls of Kingston, informal spaces where poor and working-class Jamaicans who were unwelcome in the city's tonier nightclubs could dance freely. Dancehall was a combination of reggae, dub, and electronic music, and was a reflection of what it meant to be

Jamaican: the lyrics were often delivered in local patois and spoke to issues of injustice. This music, and the butt-centric dance moves it inspired, would travel to the United States along with a wave of Jamaican immigrants in the sixties and seventies, where it would become a fundamental ingredient in the creation of hip-hop. By the 1980s, hip-hop had spread across the United States, including to New Orleans, where local musicians and dancers, deeply influenced by the cultural history of the city, would in turn create bounce, a high-energy, call-and-response-based music with heavy bass and a rapid beat.

Although undoubtedly used colloquially for some time prior, the first known public use of the word *twerk* as a verb appears in the lyrics of the first bounce hit, “Do the Jubilee All,” released by New Orleans rapper DJ Jubilee in 1993. The music video has a homemade feel, showcasing everyday men and women twerking alongside a marching band. There are moments when DJ Jubilee points approvingly to a shaking butt, but the video doesn’t sexualize the butt to the degree found in other butt-forward videos of the era, from artists like Sir Mix-A-Lot and 2 Live Crew. Instead, we see iconic New Orleans metal balconies, tuba players on a football field, and Jubilee sporting his signature style—a white T-shirt and khaki shorts. In this primordial twerking video, the dance move is less about sex and much more about the city where it originated.

After “Jubilee,” twerk began cropping up in the lyrics of mainstream pop hits, like the Ying Yang Twins’ “Whistle While You Twurk” and Destiny’s Child’s “Jumpin’, Jumpin’.” Still, it remained mostly a New Orleans phenomenon, evolving and expanding rapidly through the many subcultures and communities of the city. The queer community, in particular, came to embrace the style after a drag queen named Katey Red performed a bounce set at a local club in 1998. In the early 2000s, she and Big Freedia became well-known in the New Orleans scene for raunchy, stylish lyrics that openly engaged with queer themes, and for their enthusiastic use of twerk in their shows, leading to the formation of a subgenre of bounce called sissy bounce. “A lot of people think bounce is simply a booty-shaking dance from the ghetto,” Big Freedia says. “But bounce is as shallow or deep as you want to make it. The groin area has extraordinary power. Moving it at lightning speed is more than sexual; it’s also deeply intimate and transformative. For us sissies, who lived under such constant

oppression—the violence, poverty, and homophobia—bounce is our way to transmute that pain into joy.”

It wasn't until 2005, after Hurricane Katrina hit, that bounce emerged from the region in a major way. The devastation of the hurricane and its aftermath was brutal and cruel, leaving more than 1,800 people dead, 80 percent of the city underwater, and 1.2 million displaced. The mass diaspora that resulted brought the city's subcultures to new parts of the country, and all of a sudden Katey Red, Big Freedia, and other bounce artists found themselves performing in clubs in Houston, Nashville, and Atlanta. New audiences were being exposed to bounce and twerk for the first time, and the rise of shareable videos on sites like YouTube brought even wider awareness. A group of dancers from Atlanta called Twerk Team gained significant popularity on the site, prompting girls and women of color to upload clips of themselves twerking joyfully in their bedrooms and living rooms.

Twerk had gone national but still had not hit its peak popularity. That moment would come almost a decade later, nearly three centuries after the French first brought enslaved people to New Orleans, in a pop culture frenzy instigated by a young white woman trying to show the world she was no longer a child.

# MILEY



**D**estiny Hope Cyrus was born in 1992 in Franklin, Tennessee. Although she would later claim normal, if not exactly humble, beginnings, from the start there was more than a whiff of Nashville fame about her, and a good bit of money and opportunity—her father was a successful country singer with a recent *Billboard* crossover hit, “Achy Breaky Heart.” As an infant, the story goes, Destiny Hope grinned so often, her parents nicknamed her Smiley. Eventually, it was shortened to Miley. The name stuck.

Growing up, Miley Cyrus was, at least according to her public image, a good American girl. She was baptized and went to church on Sundays. She wore a purity ring. Dolly Parton was her godmother. And when she was twelve years old, she got a job playing a good American girl on television.

*Hannah Montana* premiered on the Disney Channel in 2006 and followed Miley Stewart, a “typical” middle school girl by day who, on nights and weekends, transforms into famous pop singer Hannah Montana (the simple act of donning a blond wig rendering her unrecognizable to family and friends). As silly as the premise might have been, the majority of the show focused on typical growing pains—crushes, homework, identity, and the everyday embarrassments of being a preteen—and presented a complicated blend of fiction and reality. The real-life Miley Cyrus and her TV alter egos were presented as Christian, goofy, wholesome, and entirely nonthreatening to the parents of America. Both Miley Cyrus and Miley Stewart have a country-music-singer father who helps write her songs and manage her career, and they both happen to be Billy Ray Cyrus, who also played Robby Ray Stewart on the show. The songs that Miley-as-Miley-as-Hannah performed on the show became pop hits and resulted in an

album that, in 2007, Miley-as-Miley-as-Hannah went on tour to promote, and in 2009 Disney released *Hannah Montana: The Movie*. On a branding level, it was genius, a nearly perfect symbiosis that invested young fans in two characters for the price of one and motivated them to devote time and money across numerous platforms. The problem, of course, was that one of the people was real, and, eventually, she would come to want what all previous Disney tween stars wanted: to grow up.

The final season of *Hannah Montana* aired in 2011, with Miley making the decision to go off to college with her best friend instead of shooting a film as Hannah. The real-life Cyrus was eighteen, coming off a massive hit single under her own name, “Party in the USA,” and it wasn’t clear what she could or should do next. She released more music, but the albums didn’t sell well, at least by her standards. She acted in several films but received consistently terrible reviews, and some were financial flops (the Nicholas Sparks adaptation *The Last Song*, released amid tabloid coverage of her romance with her costar Liam Hemsworth, was a notable exception). In 2010, she was caught on camera smoking salvia from a bong—typical teen behavior, but also a clear affront to her straitlaced image. If she was going to successfully transition out of her Hannah Montana persona and establish herself as a different kind of performer and star, it seemed Cyrus needed to do something bold. And fast. That’s where things got complicated.

In a documentary made by MTV about the rollout of her 2013 album *Bangerz*, Cyrus describes that year in her life as “not a transition” but a “movement,” a classification she was so committed to that the documentary itself is called *Miley: The Movement*. The word is a clear reference to the shift from one state (childhood) to another (adulthood) but is perhaps also an attempt to position herself as a leader and inspiration to legions of her fans about to go through the same change. Her album contained songs with more adult themes and had been created in collaboration with well-respected producers such as Pharrell and Mike Willy instead of the Disney machine.

In the publicity, music videos, lyrics, and overall aesthetics of her new album, Cyrus had made clear that her more mature brand would not only feel “urban” but also weave in Black cultural forms and sounds. The cookie-cutter Hannah

Montana lyrics of her past (“Life’s what you make it, so let’s make it rock”) turned into statements of defiance that evoked hip-hop vernacular (“You ain’t with it, could’ve said that / Why you tripping, let me hit that”), and her look transformed from jeans and sparkly tank tops to gold grills and garments that left her nearly nude. A line was being drawn, it seemed, between her previous, squeaky-clean innocence and her new, unabashed rebellion and foray into nonwhite culture. This radical shift was put clearly on display for millions at the 2013 MTV Video Music Awards, in one of the most controversial live performances of the 2010s.

It started with a giant space teddy bear sitting on the stage of Brooklyn’s Barclays Center. The bear was brown and several stories tall and had a face that looked like it had been designed by the engineers of the starship *Enterprise*, composed entirely of flashing lights. The bear’s torso popped open and out stepped Cyrus, wearing a silver leotard emblazoned with another teddy bear’s face (magenta ears covered her breasts). Two bright blond pigtails sprouted from her otherwise buzzed head. She clung to the side of the bear’s open torso and stuck out her tongue. A male voice, manipulated to sound spacey, began to chant, “Twerk twerk twerk twerk it out,” as Cyrus dismounted the bear. A long line of dancers dressed in pink teddy bear costumes then populated the stage, proceeding to dance around Cyrus as she sang the first lyrics of her new single, “We Can’t Stop,” her own body gyrating smoothly to the music. And then, a group of four Black women—the only Black women to appear during the performance, and the only women not fashion-model thin—appeared onstage wearing tight stretch pants and huge stuffed teddy bears affixed to their backs. They began to shake their butts, their oversized accessories bouncing to the rhythm.

Cyrus herself was lithe and waifish, her butt and breasts both small. And yet she, too, determinedly shook her butt (she was, she would say later, twerking). In an effort perhaps to hammer home the point of the whole exercise, Cyrus greedily grabbed the butt of one of the bear-laden, big-butt Black dancers as she belted the lyric “Doing whatever we want.”

Shortly after this moment, “We Can’t Stop” transitioned into the opening chords of a massive summer hit, Robin Thicke’s “Blurred Lines” (a song also

produced by Pharrell, which would soon be embroiled in controversy over its apparent endorsement of rape culture and use of uncredited elements of Marvin Gaye's "Got to Give It Up"). As Cyrus ripped off her silver teddy bear leotard to reveal a flesh-colored latex bikini and began to prance, Thicke himself emerged, wearing a referee-striped suit. Cyrus appeared all but naked, but she did have a prop: a white foam finger, the type you'd hold up at a football game to signify "We're number one!" For the next three minutes, Cyrus danced athletically and provocatively: bending over and shaking her butt (more in the manner of an animal shaking off bathwater than a practiced twerker), strutting all around and repeatedly rubbing the foam finger in her crotch. Taken as a whole, it was a weird spectacle. Cyrus doesn't seem quite comfortable, as though she's making up many of the dance moves as she goes along. She is goofy and gawky in her efforts to communicate, *I'm no longer a child, no longer Hannah Montana*. But even she seems less than 100 percent convinced.

That evening was likely the first time that many viewers at home—particularly white viewers—had heard the word *twerk* or seen the movement itself, but the performance suggested little of its rich history or technical strength. Cyrus's dance was an anemic interpretation, and the twerkers hired as backup dancers hadn't been able to show the full range of their skill, thanks to the teddy bears strapped to their bodies.

Cyrus would later say that the performance was meant to be "obviously funny," but for weeks after the VMAs, the media was ablaze with aghast commentary and a disproportionate amount of outrage. The *Los Angeles Times* reported that reactions to Cyrus's new path veered between "disgust and sadness," while singer Kelly Clarkson tweeted in response to the performance: "2 words... #pitchystrippers." *The View* cohost Sherri Shepherd told Jay Leno that Cyrus was "going to hell in a twerking handbasket," and *Morning Joe* coanchor Mika Brzezinski called the whole affair "really, really disturbing." The man who invented the foam finger expressed anger and shame, and the director of the Parents Television Council stated, "MTV has once again succeeded in marketing sexually charged messages to young children using former child stars and condom commercials—while falsely rating this program as appropriate for kids as young as fourteen. This is unacceptable."

Of all the day-after critics, Brooke Shields, who had played Hannah Montana's deceased mother on the show, had perhaps the most apt word to describe it: *desperate*. Cyrus was trying to prove that she was grown-up but seemed to be playacting the part more than living it. If the performance was harmful to tween girls, it was because it was such a strange, awkward performance of sexuality, and any attempt to replicate it would likely result in humiliation.

The media reaction was, surely, precisely what Cyrus intended. Within a matter of minutes, she had severed herself once and for all from her Hannah Montana alter ego and announced herself as an unapologetically sexual being. Her butt, and the butts of the women she hired to dance with her, were apparently a crucial part of "the movement," and Cyrus later doubled down on this during her tour, attaching a large prosthetic butt to her waist and using it as part of her choreography when she took the show on tour. The crude sculpted pad made her petite *derrière* appear enormous and comical, bursting through a silver thong. The butt was also removable, which was yet another way she asserted her whiteness and privilege—just like women who wore bustles in the nineteenth century, Cyrus could make a choice to be aligned with Blackness or not in any given moment. She was using a prop to "play" in Blackness, manipulating it for her own ends. Cyrus was adopting and exploiting a form of dance that had long been popular in poor and working-class Black communities and simultaneously playing into the stereotype of the hypersexual Black woman, all in an effort to declare to the world that she was no longer a child.

In the weeks following the VMAs, Cyrus's response to all the charges leveled against her was essentially: *I'm young, I'm having fun. Stop taking it all so seriously*, dismissing the belief that she had a responsibility as a public figure and role model, while still encouraging fans to become part of the "the movement." In the documentary, she offers a justification for her behavior during the *Bangerz* era: "I live in America. The land of the free. And I feel like if you can't express yourself, you aren't very free." It isn't entirely clear what she means when she says this, because it is readily apparent that Cyrus *could* express herself. She did whatever she wanted (as the "We Can't Stop" lyric suggests) on one of the biggest stages in the world. She endured criticism, but it certainly appeared that



stirring up controversy was what she'd been hoping for. A few years later, in a 2017 *Billboard* magazine profile, she offered another response: "It's mind-boggling to me that there was even a controversy about me having black dancers... People said I was taking advantage of black culture. That wasn't true. Those were the dancers I liked!" In other words: she couldn't have done something racist, she says, because she actually *liked* her Black dancers.

Shortly after Cyrus's twerk debacle, the most mainstream and white of cultural outlets—publications like *Vogue* and the *New York Times*—fully threw themselves into the butt business, publishing articles like "Starting from the Bottom: Experts Weigh in on the Cultural Obsession with the Butt" and "For Posteriors' Sake," which both outlined and attempted to explain what they described as a new interest in the butt across American culture. Butts had become so pervasive, so visible, and so interesting to white people that they could no longer be ignored as a cultural, or economic, phenomenon. The issue, as many writers of color noted, was they had already been one for quite some time—it just had not been regularly covered in the pages of *Vogue*. As writers like Allison P. Davis pointed out, any "discovery" of the butt wasn't so different from Columbus's "discovery" of America. The butt had always been there, even if white people had failed to notice for decades.

# THE YEAR OF THE BUTT



Cyrus's performance was one of the most notorious butt-related moments leading up to the very booty year of 2014, which many pop culture media outlets came to call "the Year of the Butt." It was a period when an interest in butts seemed to suddenly be everywhere: in magazines (such as Kardashian's now-legendary *Paper* cover), on Instagram, on the *Billboard* charts, and in the offices and operating rooms of the nation's plastic surgeons, where the frequency of the cosmetic surgery procedure known as the Brazilian butt lift had undergone a massive spike.

For almost every major plastic surgery procedure, the American Society of Plastic Surgeons makes public both recent and historical data, but the organization didn't even start to record statistics about butt augmentation until 2012. That year 8,654 butt augmentation procedures were performed; by 2014 the number reached 11,505, a 33 percent increase in just two years. The Brazilian butt lift—or BBL, as it was more commonly called—was developed in the 1990s as an alternative to silicone implants, previously the only other option for butt augmentation. During the procedure, a surgeon uses liposuction to remove fat from the patient's stomach, lower back, and thighs and injects it into the butt. Although a BBL creates a more "natural" look, it can be a dangerous approach, especially when performed by an inexperienced surgeon, because of how easy it is to inadvertently inject fat into the major blood vessels running from the legs to the torso and lungs, which can cause a fatal embolism. The American Society of Plastic Surgeons issued a warning in 2018 about the dangers of BBLs, citing a death rate of one in three thousand—a rate "far greater than any other cosmetic surgery"—but still the number of BBLs performed has

continued to steadily grow—in 2019, more than 28,000 were performed, up 16.5 percent from the year before.

The BBL may be the most extreme way for women to alter their butts, but it is hardly the only way. By 2014, many of the moves from the *Buns of Steel* video had found their way into women's magazines offering tips for toning, tightening, and lifting the butt. Some magazines promised the keys to unlocking the look of Kim Kardashian's bulbous, round butt, while others offered exercises to sculpt a ballet dancer's petite and muscular backside, and still others instructed readers on how to achieve something akin to the slight but highly coveted silhouette Pippa Middleton had displayed to the world at her sister's royal wedding to Prince William.

The variations were likely due to a larger conundrum facing wide-circulation women's magazines: for decades they'd been cultivating, and profiting from, fat phobia, but now they had to contend with the emergence of a new, fleshier body ideal. After so many years and so much ink dedicated to the "melting away" of fat, the only way editors knew how to engage with the desire for a big butt was to make it something earned through endless exercise and dietary regimes, a blend of flesh and muscle that could only be achieved through hard work, self-sacrifice, and a healthy amount of shame.

Butts had also become a shareable commodity thanks to social media, which helped to dramatically amplify all the other changes that were afoot. In 2013, a Long Islander named Jen Selter first coined the term *belfie*, a portmanteau of *butt* and *selfie* that, despite its name, was less about an individual's documentation of their own butt—many belfies had to be taken by other people, because of the challenging contortion required to photograph one's own backside—and more about a very specific photographic pose that centered the butt in an Instagrammable image and featured a coy over-the-shoulder peek. It's a pose Kim Kardashian had been modeling and perfecting for years (the promotional image from the first season of *KUWTK* is an excellent example) and a look that is both sweet and sexy. It also puts a face to the butt, disrupting the anonymity that is so often a part of rear-end appreciation. When she coined the term, Selter was a rising fitness star who boasted a shapely, if small, white butt and a fitness column in the *New York Post* called "Kicking Butt," in which

she promised to help women exercise their way to a comely rear. But, for Selter, there emerged another, more direct route to monetizing her commitment to a quality butt: she began posting her belfies on Instagram, which quickly turned out to be lucrative—according to Selter, every belfie she posted drew five thousand new Instagram followers, which then translated to significant income in promotions and fitness clients. “Anyone who works hard could be where I am,” she told *Elle* magazine in 2013. You could take Selter’s meaning in two ways: hard work can earn you a good butt, but it can also turn you into a millionaire.

The music industry also was cashing in on the Year of the Butt thanks to a string of hits. Jennifer Lopez released the anthem “Booty,” a collaboration with fellow proudly callipygian pop star Iggy Azalea. Beyoncé, the woman who had introduced the world to the word *bootylicious* a decade before, released her eponymous album, whose music videos prominently featured her barely clad butt, accompanied by a slew of music videos and televised performances that featured butt-forward dancing and posing. And white singer-songwriter Meghan Trainor offered up “All About That Bass,” a reference to her own big butt, featuring lyrics that were ostensibly body-positive, like “I won’t be no stick-figure, silicone Barbie doll” and “Every inch of you is perfect from the bottom to the top.”

That August, Nicki Minaj released “Anaconda,” a song that directly referenced and sampled “Baby Got Back” and foregrounded Minaj’s butt in both the music video and the lyrics (“He say don’t like ’em boney, he want something he can grab”). In sampling “Baby Got Back,” Minaj nodded to the lineage of butts in mainstream hip-hop, but she was also asserting her control over the narrative of the big-butt Black woman. She was not a headless gyrating body, as were the women of “Baby Got Back,” but instead the creator of the music, the controller of the image, and the maker of the money. If there was exploitation, it was self-exploitation, and a choice Minaj herself was making.

The butt song was a lucrative subgenre to be operating within, but for the original New Orleans bounce performers Katey Red and Big Freedia—people who in many senses built twerk into the very thing Miley Cyrus and others would later commodify—financial success and recognition came slower, and

with not nearly as much of a bang. Katey Red started recording an album in 1998, but it wasn't until 2011 that the album and music video were finally released; she has never achieved widespread mainstream fame or name recognition, despite her crucial role in the history of bounce and twerk. Big Freedia fared better. In 2013, she starred in her own reality show on the Fuse network, *Big Freedia: Queen of Bounce*. She also became an ambassador for twerk's history and cultural significance, a go-to spokesperson who teaches twerkshops at universities and published a memoir. But Freedia would always be cast as the person correcting the popular narrative rather than as the one who drove it. As Nicki Minaj said in September 2013, during the aftermath of Cyrus's VMA performance, "If a white girl does something that seems to be Black, then Black people think, *Oh, she's embracing our culture*, so they kinda ride with it. Then white people think, *Oh, she must be cool! She doin' sumpin' Black*. So it's weird! But if a Black person do a Black thang? It ain't that poppin'."

# RECLAMATION



**K**elechi Okafor, one of the most popular twerk instructors in the United Kingdom, was born in Nigeria in 1986. She moved to London when she was five, settling in a neighborhood called Peckham, in Southeast London, home to a growing Nigerian immigrant community in the 1990s, which she referred to growing up as Little Lagos. “It was almost like we never really left Nigeria,” she says. “We would go to the same markets. I heard Yoruba being spoken all around.” When I talked to Okafor, she explained that dancing was an essential part of her upbringing. “I would naturally dance at every party I’d go to. I would always, always dance.”

When she was sixteen, Okafor attended a performing arts school, where she studied musical theater. It was there that she began to attend formal ballet, tap, and jazz dance classes, and where she began to recognize that something about her appearance and dancing ability set her apart.

Okafor felt discouraged at every turn: her ballet teacher instructed her to buy pink tights for ballet, ignoring the fact that they did not match her skin tone. A career advisor told her that as a Black person, the most she could really expect from musical theater jobs was “a nice best-friend role.” When she would add vocal runs to a song in class, she would be reprimanded and told, “Sing it just as we’ve given it.” When a white woman did the same, Okafor noticed, she’d be praised for adding something creative and quirky. “I started to understand what wasn’t allowed for me but made sense if other people did it who weren’t Black.”

After high school, she went to Liverpool Hope University to study drama and law. It was her first time away from home and the first time she had the space and freedom to explore what dance meant to her. “For the three years that I was

in Liverpool,” she says, “I pretty much ran it when it came to the nightlife.” She was well-known in the clubs and became what she calls a “mini-celebrity” because of what she was capable of on the dance floor. “It was just very free,” she says when I ask her what her moves were like. “I was butt and hip focused. I was able to really engage the sacral region.”

After university, in 2008, Okafor moved to Atlanta, a city where she didn’t know anyone, but she did know that it was the home of her favorite performer, Ciara. “I knew that we were destined to be best friends,” she says, laughing. She never met Ciara, but she did end up working in artist management for six months, mostly with rappers. Many of those artists performed at strip clubs, or went to strip clubs following their performances, and often they brought Okafor along with them. It was there that she was first introduced to pole dancing, and immediately fell in love with it. “Respectability politics shrouds sex work and pole dancing, but all I saw was really, really raw unadulterated power,” she says.

In 2009, Okafor returned to the UK and worked in a call center while looking for work as an actor and studying to become a personal trainer. A few years later, she decided to take pole dancing lessons, and within a few months she had made her way through all the levels available at a local dance studio. Before long, she was asked to teach classes herself, which quickly became popular in part because she brought with her a knowledge of physiology and anatomy and helped her students to understand how the dances worked with their bodies. In 2014, the white owners of the studio asked her if she might teach twerk. “I thought, *Why? Is that a thing [that you think] Black people do?*” She told them she wasn’t sure if her moves were twerking, per se, but agreed to demonstrate how she danced in the Liverpool clubs. Impressed, they immediately asked if she would teach her moves as a class, just as soon as she shadowed one of their existing twerk classes. “I went to this class,” she recalled, “and I was horrified.” There were only two people in attendance, apart from the instructor and Okafor, and the teacher was demonstrating basic moves—bum isolations and jiggling—without showing the students how to assemble them into a unified whole. “I could hear the beat, but I don’t know if she could hear the beat,” Okafor says. “Nothing was marrying.” She decided that she would take a different approach. Within a few weeks of her first class, her Twerking for

Beginners had completely sold out, and the studio added more class sessions to accommodate the increase in demand. Okafor was thrilled. “I was just loving the fact that I could teach people the mechanics of what happens when I dance, and break it down for them and break down the language and the relationship between music and sensuality and show them how to express that physically.”

The popularity of the classes and Okafor’s growing social media following were exciting for the studio’s owners—as was the money her classes were bringing to the studio—but they also wanted to manage the definition of *twerk* in their space and make sure it adhered to what they thought their customers wanted. They asked Okafor if they could rename her class Tribal Twerk, to signal that she was teaching movements that they believed the average white student couldn’t execute.

Okafor confronted similar problems at other studios. In an effort to expand her reach, she wrote a studio in Manchester to see about teaching a workshop. She noticed that they had credited Miley Cyrus as an originator of twerk, an error she found troubling and was eager to help correct. “I don’t enjoy your style of twerk,” the white studio owner said in response. “I find it basic. When me and my girls twerk, we put our knee pads on and we throw down.”

Okafor posted the studio owner’s response on Twitter, and the tweet went viral, particularly in the United States. “Black American women were furious,” Okafor recalled. “They said: *This is what’s been happening to us for centuries. We are the originators of something, then it’s appropriated by white people, then it’s repackaged for a mainstream consciousness for people to make profits off of, and we are denigrated in the process.*”

---

White women’s interest in twerk in the 2010s, and in large butts more generally, is in some ways a curious thing. Although there have been high-profile examples of white women dabbling in Black fashion and popular culture before—whether through Bo Derek’s cornrows, Madonna’s voguing, or even the bustle—white women have often chosen segregation over appropriation, leaving the latter largely to their male counterparts. But in the 2010s, this began to change,



and the center of that change was an unprecedented and deep engagement with large butts and twerking.

When I asked Okafor why she thinks so many white women take her twerk classes, she explained, “It has to do with Western femininity. When white supremacy was evolving, there had to be something to fight for, and womanhood, femininity, and white feminine purity became that thing. And so white women became trapped within that narrative.” Okafor further noted that white men often see it as their duty to protect this mythological innocent white woman, particularly from the perceived physical and sexual threat of nonwhite men. “And I think that that is why white women feel called to twerk—because there’s still that internal and external battle, to break the chains of white feminine purity.

“We also have to address the intergenerational jealousy from the fact that Black women’s bodies were desired by white men during the times of slavery,” Okafor continues. She explains that there is a question that must have haunted white women as white men ogled and desired Black women: “*Why are my men desiring this one? If I can emulate her in some way, that desirability [can come back to] me.*” This jealousy of Black women’s supposed sexual capacity and potency, of course, has a long lineage, back to at least the era of Sarah Baartman, the bustle, and 1814’s *The Hottentot Venus; or, The Hatred of Frenchwomen*.

To escape the larger mythology of purity, white women often mimic Black women, buying into stereotypes of hypersexuality. This is the story of many young starlets, including Christina Aguilera, Britney Spears, and, of course, Miley Cyrus. “They have to go through a dirty phase, which is their way of entering a more autonomous aspect of womanhood,” Okafor says, but in order to do this, “they emulate an almost bastardized version of Black womanhood. And once they’ve got their freedom, they throw it away.” For Okafor, Blackness was constructed to “accommodate everybody who’s been ostracized in whichever way, shape, or form,” including white women. “But that isn’t fair,” she says, “because usually [those people] can leave in a way that Black women cannot.”

In 2016, Okafor opened her own studio in London, where she has taught twerk and pole dance classes ever since, offering her students both an academic

understanding of the history of dance and biomechanics as well as an intuitive relationship with movement and her lived expertise as a survivor of sexual abuse. For years, Okafor didn't speak about her own history of abuse, but now she sees twerk as a way to override that silence and connect with and take ownership over her body. "I'm reclaiming my body through dance," she says. "I'm able to offer that to people with transparency and vulnerability. There has always been so much violence and trauma around the area of [the hips and bum] when it comes to femmes."

Okafor teaches that twerk doesn't start from the butt, and you don't need a big butt to twerk well. "It starts from your feet and it travels up. That [comes from] the rootedness of West African culture and West African dance. When we look at Senegal, when we look at Nigeria, it's a lot of footwork." When she sees other Europeans twerk—there's a surprisingly large population of Russian and Eastern European twerk teachers online—she thinks they overuse their thoracic vertebrae. "There's a lot of heavy convulsion," she says.

Okafor hopes that students walk away from her classes with an understanding of the ways that different movements have been used in the history of African diasporic dance. "I hope that they get a very thorough understanding of twerk and of its history. I talk to them about where movements originate. How a flick of the foot might have shape-shifted and traveled to New Orleans." She has also built a significant social media presence, as well as a robust career as a writer, podcaster, and actor, hoping that the information and context she provides will spread beyond the community of her studio. "Why not use the space and the communities that I have to educate them so when they go out, the education can pass along?"

---

Global culture is in many ways driven by borrowing, mixing, and remixing: all music, dance, art, and fashion draws, to some extent, on traditions and experiences beyond the identity and culture of the creator. Without this cultural intermixing, not only would we not have rock 'n' roll, we would not have twerk.

And yet, borrowing can easily become harmful when it occurs unconsciously, without attribution, or without consideration for history. Miley Cyrus is an almost cartoonish example of cultural appropriation: she was frank, and extreme, in her exploitation of twerk to shed her childish image, and she readily cast aside her sexy, faux-big-butt persona when it no longer suited her, instead choosing to reframe the new phase of her career and image around classic rock heroines like Joan Jett and Stevie Nicks. She made huge amounts of money off her performances and apparently never made any public mention of the origins of twerk in Black and queer communities. She also easily sloughed it off post-*Bangerz*.

But the lesson of Cyrus isn't only a lesson about a badly behaved celebrity. It's a lesson about understanding our motives and trying to uncover the desires simmering beneath our initial, conscious reckonings. I didn't spend the 2010s taking twerk classes or snapping belfies for Instagram. But I did enjoy, if that's even the right word, the fruits of changes in beauty standards that evolved over the past thirty years, and how the meaning of and appreciation for big butts had changed in mainstream culture. Men, and women, seemed to see my body differently than they had in the late 1990s. After a meeting at the museum where I worked in the early 2010s, I walked up the stairs a few feet in front of a coworker and he called out: *Look at that butt!* It made me uncomfortable and he shouldn't have said it. But it was also true that a part of me was a little bit thrilled—thrilled that he noticed, thrilled that I was being perceived as sexy. By the time the year of the butt rolled around, three whiskeys in to most of my dates, the person I was with—regardless of gender or race—would usually grab my butt and whisper something about it. They all seemed to have unleashed the part of themselves that liked big butts, and my body had become more coveted as a result. And I enjoyed it. When I wore tight dresses that showed my butt off, I felt some of its power.

But I also felt its limits. As a teenager, I knew my butt to be only big and gross. All of a sudden, it felt big and sexy. And while this may have constituted an improvement, my butt was still stubbornly *present*. I sometimes wanted to hide it, to make it disappear. I wanted it to mean nothing, to be invisible to the people around me. I wanted to be able to walk up to a podium to give a talk and

not think about what people were looking at as I approached the mic. But my body was always there, saying something, meaning something, whether I liked it or not.

What are white women seeking when they dabble in Black culture? The answer may be different for each of us, but for me Kelechi Okafor offers a good place to start: access to sexiness, an opportunity to rebel, a way to push beyond the rigidity of white femininity. But those needs aren't always ones we can articulate easily, or thoroughly, and so we resolve them thoughtlessly.

By turning to Blackness in an attempt to solve these problems of whiteness, white women turn away from the origins of the shame we carry about our bodies, a shame that comes from the construction of whiteness itself, a shame that exists to enforce the idea that some bodies are innocent and others are sexual, that some bodies are better and others worse. In the process, not only do we harm others, but we harm ourselves by never really understanding where our shame comes from.

## *Conclusion*

Last fall, I threw out the only pair of blue jeans I still had left. My thighs had been rubbing together with every step, and the material between my legs had pilled and then frayed, eventually becoming all weft and no warp. Finally, I sat down on a stoop and was greeted by a satisfying and demoralizing tear—the jeans had ripped open entirely along the bottom of my left cheek.

It took many months to muster the courage to shop for a new pair. Since the days of watching my mom try on clothes at Hudson's, I'd been in hundreds of dressing rooms, and almost all seemed to have been designed to foster low-level shame. In some the lighting provided a high-contrast glimpse of the craggy cellulite on my hips; in others, a mirror was strategically angled to make my thighs appear huge. Sometimes, a peppy young salesperson cheered me on from the other side of a thin curtain, convinced I could squeeze myself into a size smaller than the one I'd chosen. I would suck in my stomach and stuff my butt into pants that had no hope of containing it, inexplicably trying to appease a stranger so that she in turn might reassure me that I was good enough.

Finally, after several months of putting off a shopping trip, I dragged myself to lower Manhattan to hunt down the elusive replacement pair. There I ventured into a shop with an all-glass façade, a bright white stoop, and an entire wall of neatly stacked pants in indigo, cornflower, and faded black. I looked up and down, unsure if my size was more akin to a rare, top-shelf bourbon or a cheap wine with a cupcake on the label stashed near the floor. I sifted through one pile and then another, seeing only size 27s and 28s, before finally finding a pair that might fit me at the very bottom of a pile. They were high waisted and acid washed, an updated version of the mom jeans that I swore as a teenager I'd never wear.

I pulled the dressing room curtain shut, studied myself in the large mirror leaning against the wall at an unsympathetic angle, and disrobed. As I fastened the button, I felt the privacy of the moment. It was just me in that room, having an ordinary experience. I was running an errand, checking off a task that had lingered too long on my list.

For a moment, a blaze of hope lifted me, but when I studied myself longer in the mirror, it was clear that the pants were wrong. Even in this age when garment manufacturers promise diversity in size and shape, this store had only one pair of pants in my size, and they bagged weirdly in the legs, felt taut across the butt, and gaped at the waist. They looked big and loose in the mirror, and when I turned around to glance at my butt, I felt a familiar sting of disappointment.

That feeling, I realized, was among those that most interested me when I started writing this book. It is a common, everyday sentiment experienced in a mundane circumstance, one that gnaws away at one's self-image. But it is also so familiar and banal that it's all too easy to ignore.

I was interested in this dressing room angst because it seemed so personal, but I knew it was deeply interconnected with centuries of history, culture, and politics. I had often dismissed anxiety about my body as trivial or shallow. But the politics of race and gender are the politics of bodies, and investigating the thoughts and presumptions we carry about our bodies and the bodies of those around us is crucial and profound. Thoughts like, *My butt is so big!*, *Am I developing a paunch?*, and *Aren't mom jeans supposed to be good for people with my body shape?* bubble up not only from notions of bodies we absorb via Instagram or through ads on billboards or in subways, but from sources deep in our collective past.

After years of researching butts, and coming to a better understanding of the apparently ever-shifting yet somehow always philosophically consistent doctrine of mainstream beauty standards, I know that my feelings about my butt are part of a lineage, informed by Georges Cuvier's autopsy report of Sarah Baartman, Ruth O'Brien's trove of data collected—and discarded—by her measuring squads, Gordon Conway's drawings of freewheeling flappers, and Greg Smithey's VHS tape promising women a way to transcend their fleshy, imperfect

forms. These feelings come from the way in which big butts became equated with hypersexuality and Blackness, the way that small butts came to symbolize fashion and freedom, the way strong butts were synonymous with discipline, self-control, and self-respect. And they come from the way that talking about women's butts has, for at least two centuries, been a way to talk about, and around, questions of race, gender, and what bodies mean. It's like getting dressed on a cold winter's day, pulling on two or three pairs of socks, wearing long underwear under sweatpants and ski pants on top of it all. There's a body in there somewhere—a scientific, biological fact—but one that's covered up, made invisible, by the layers heaped upon it. On and in our bodies, we carry histories—those described in this book, and many more besides. Histories of our families, of our lives, and of the world. Our feelings about our bodies are the legacy of people and stories from long ago.

I'd like to say that learning something of these histories freed me from negative feelings about my body, but this sort of knowledge isn't a magic bullet. On the other side of my research, I still feel uncomfortable in the dressing room, still feel like I don't fit when I try on clothes. Ideas and prejudices about bodies imprint early and deeply, and so the first rush of feeling I have when I pull up my jeans still contains a healthy dose of shame, and likely always will. But what this research has offered is a way to understand and contextualize that shame, and it has helped me to question the way I think and the assumptions I make. It has made these large, structural forces seem less vague. It has helped me to articulate, and understand, the way I feel about bodies. And it has given me hope. After the voice in my head whispers, *Your butt is too big*, there is another that asks: *Too big for what? Too big according to whom? Why is big so bad?*

I've often thought about how, despite the fact that this book is very much about butts, it could have been about almost anything. And this gives me hope, too. A close examination of the parts of ourselves that can feel unbearable—whether body parts, emotions, or desires—can be transformative. By growing curious about the sources of shame and by putting that shame in context, we don't excuse ourselves, or even get beyond it. Instead, we turn toward rather than away, a gesture that allows for new possibilities and knowledge.

Understanding the way people of the past shaped the present is also a means of uncovering mechanisms for how we all might shape a future. The fact that human beings from the past created the meanings our different bodies hold shows us that people today can re-create, or discard, those meanings. One of the great gifts of looking closely at the past is that things that once felt inevitable and immutable begin to feel surmountable, changeable, transitory. People create the meanings that are the source of shame, which means that other people—like Rosezella Canty-Letsome, Deb Burgard, Kelechi Okafor, Vinnie Cuccia, and Alex Bartlett—can change them once more.

Our bodies, by their very nature, resist control, a fact that always has felt paradoxically triumphant when I encounter it. We invent bustles and girdles and exercise videos and cabbage diets and sizing schemes, but our bodies have their own agenda, and so they rarely obey us. Some people want their butt to be big, some people want their butt to be small. But a butt will, for the most part, always remain what it is. As the human mind tries to hammer a body into submission—tries to create meaning, tries to change its shape and appearance, tries to make it something it is not and cannot be—the human body stubbornly refuses to oblige.

It is maybe for this reason that I decided to buy the blue jeans that didn't quite fit. I chose to live with their being just good enough. Sometimes now when I wear them, I feel anxious about the way they look—the tightness in the butt and the looseness in the waist. And sometimes, of course, I feel the familiar pang of annoyance that it's so hard to find a pair of pants that actually fits. But ultimately, I sense a physical reminder of that push and pull between body and mind, between the desire to wrest control and the reality that bodies will always insist on being exactly what they are.

It's been thirty years since I sat on the fleecy toilet cover in my parents' bathroom, watching my mother get dressed, soothed by the warmth and safety I associated with her body and the predictability of her morning ritual, imagining that my body would grow into one like hers. My adult mornings are different from those—I largely work from home and have never been very adept with curlers and lotions and mascara and perfume and all the other high-femme ablutions. But sometimes, when I'm preparing to teach a class or go to a party,



I'll lean over the sink with my face close to the mirror to curl my eyelashes, my butt sticking out. I'll dig out a bottle of hairspray and crack the window so it won't stink up the bathroom. And I'll look myself over in the mirror, trying to get a glimpse of my butt. My body does look a bit like my mom's, with its big butt and wide hips. And sometimes, when I'm standing there in my underwear, before I've pulled on pants or stepped into the world, my butt doesn't feel like a problem or a blessing. It's just a fact.

# *Acknowledgments*

If I've learned anything in my life, it's that creative work happens inside a community of support. I'm so grateful to all the friends, thinkers, artists, and writers who have contributed and been crucial to this project.

The idea for this book started as a little bit of a joke with Damon Locks, whom I'm lucky to call a friend and whose work and life as an artist are a constant inspiration. Damon was one of the many artists I met during my time at the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum in the early 2010s, where some of the most brilliant, warmhearted, hilarious, and creative people I've ever known worked together to make a very special thing. It was from these people—including Isis Ferguson, Lisa Junkin Lopez, Tara Lane, Jen Ash, and the incomparable Lisa Yun Lee—that I absorbed and formed so many of my ideas about politics, history, art, and the possibilities for joy in social movements. This book couldn't exist without them and everything they taught me.

I am extraordinarily grateful to those who believed I was capable of being a writer before I ever could. To Shannon Heffernan, whose friendship, humor, and care has kept me company on both the darkest and most joyful of days. To Lulu Miller, who has shown me how big and beautiful a life could be. To Michelle Boyd, who encouraged me in the moment I needed it most and taught me how to care for myself during times of grief.

Thank you to the teachers I found in Columbia's MFA program, including Leslie Jamison, Hilton Als, Margo Jefferson, Philip Lopate, and Eliza Griswold, whose lessons and support have helped to form me as a writer. To Sam Freedman, who accepted this peculiar-sounding project into his book proposal class and shaped both me and the book over the course of a semester. To the many friends I met during my time at Columbia who became in-the-trenches

colleagues, including Noah Shannon, Dan Lefferts, Moeko Fujii, Sasha Bonet, Lisa Factora-Borchers, Harrison Hill, Synne Borgen, Robyn Price, Ari Braverman, Kay Zhang, Maud Doyle, Jonathan Fetter-Vorn, and Jordan Kisner.

Thank you to my agent, Matt McGowen, who had faith in me from the beginning and who always believed that a book about butts could be a serious work of nonfiction. To my editor, Julianna Haubner, whose notes improved the book in innumerable ways, and to all the people at Avid Reader who supported this project behind the scenes.

In the early days of working on the book proposal, I received a grant from the Columbia School of the Arts that allowed me to travel to London and Paris, where I researched the life of Sarah Baartman and the history of the bustle. I'm very grateful for having been able to make that trip and for the reporting opportunities it provided. I'm also indebted to the Metcalf Internship Program at the University of Chicago, which paid for Audrey Fromson, Faryn Thomas, Kitty Luo, Maggie Riviera, Cait Lozado, and Bella Costantino to work with me as research assistants. I was thankful every day for the diligence, intelligence, and creativity of these young women who helped to make the book markedly better and the writing process significantly less lonely.

As part of my research, I interviewed many people about their bodies and their butts. I am grateful that these friends, friends of friends, and strangers were willing to be vulnerable and open in talking about their bodies. Those interviews helped me make decisions about what this book would become and helped me to think concretely beyond my own lived experience.

Thank you also to the many scholars who talked to me and whose work I drew upon for this book. A project like this stands on the shoulders of decades of important thinking and research, and I'm grateful to all the people quoted in the body of the text and referenced in the endnotes. Thank you, too, to Joe Tait, archivist at the Cleveland Museum of Natural History, for helping me find materials on Norma and Normman; Sarah Witte, women and gender studies librarian at Columbia University, who helped to track down primary sources; and to the librarians behind Columbia's "Ask a Librarian" feature, who investigated many bizarre inquiries on my behalf.

In the fall of 2019, Matt Kiely picked me up in Phoenix and drove me to Mount Mingus near Prescott where we spent two days together watching a group of humans try to outrun a group of horses. We have been friends and colleagues ever since. I'm very grateful to Matt for his interest in that story and to the geniuses at *Radiolab* for inviting me into their amazing world. Working with the *Radiolab* team has helped me to think in new ways about narrative, character, sound, and nonfiction, and I'm indebted to every one of them for bringing wonder and curiosity to my daily life.

Thank you to the people who read early drafts and sections of this book and offered their brilliant reflections and suggestions: Andrew Semans, Leslie Jamison, Lulu Miller, Robyn Price, Sasha Bonet, Dan Lefferts, Synne Borgen, Emilie Rex, Noah Shannon, Erin Williams, Jonathan Fetter-Vorn, Shannon Heffernan, Lisa Lee, Moeko Fujii, Harrison Hill, Matt Kiely, Becca Bresler, Sasha von Oldershausen, Michelle Boyd, Kathryn Tabb, Marissa Berwald, Julia Hyland Bruno, and Nicole Boettcher. A special thanks to Graham Mason, who came up with the subtitle; to Jane Fletcher, who translated from French to English (and spent a lovely week with me in Paris); to Avery Trufelman, who was regularly willing to talk through questions of fashion; and to Leslie Jamison for the tremendous friendship and constant moral support throughout the process of writing this book.

Thank you to my family, who have always offered love and encouragement: my mom and dad; Mike, Kristi, Ellis, and Ayda; and Ashley Christensen, my first and best friend. And thank you to all my friends from all parts of my life who supported me as I worked on this project. It is because of your emotional, artistic, and intellectual generosity that I'm able to make anything at all. It is a privilege to have such a robust and loving community.

Most of all, thank you to Andrew Semans, who read this book first, last, and most; who has brought me incomparable joy and love; who does not mind that I never remember to put the cap on the olive oil (or anything else). Being able to spend my life with you is the best thing that has ever happened to me.

## *About the Author*



Heather Radke is an essayist, journalist, and contributing editor and reporter at *Radiolab*, the Peabody Award–winning program from WNYC. She has written for publications including *The Believer*, *Longreads*, and *The Paris Review*, and she teaches at Columbia University’s creative writing MFA program. Before becoming a writer, Heather worked as a curator at the Jane Addams Hull-House Museum in Chicago.

 [@HRADKE](https://twitter.com/HRADKE)

[AvidReaderPress.com](http://AvidReaderPress.com)  
[SimonandSchuster.com](http://SimonandSchuster.com)

[www.SimonandSchuster.com/Authors/Heather-Radke](http://www.SimonandSchuster.com/Authors/Heather-Radke)

 [@avidreaderpress](https://www.facebook.com/avidreaderpress)  [@avidreaderpress](https://twitter.com/avidreaderpress)  [@avidreaderpress](https://www.instagram.com/avidreaderpress)

**We hope you enjoyed reading  
this Simon & Schuster ebook.**

---

Get a FREE ebook when you join our mailing list. Plus, get updates on new releases, deals, recommended reads, and more from Simon & Schuster. Click below to sign up and see terms and conditions.

**[CLICK HERE TO SIGN UP](#)**

Already a subscriber? Provide your email again so we can register this ebook and send you more of what you like to read. You will continue to receive exclusive offers in your inbox.

# Notes

## INTRODUCTION

As historian Sander Gilman: “Black Bodies, White Bodies: Toward an Iconography of Female Sexuality in Late Nineteenth-Century Art, Medicine, and Literature,” *Critical Inquiry* 12, no. 1 (1985).

“I personally do not find my butt sexy”: I conducted interviews with women and non-binary people as background research for this book. These interviews were long and wide-ranging and covered a variety of material about each person’s feelings and experiences about their butts and bodies. The quotations here are excerpted from those interviews, which were conducted between 2017 and 2021.

## MUSCLE

If you happened to find: M. D. Rose, “A Hominine Hip Bone, KNM-ER 3228, from East Lake Turkana, Kenya,” *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 63, no. 4 (1984): 371–78.

This creature was closer: Jonathan B. Losos and Daniel E. Lieberman, “Four Legs Good, Two Legs Fortuitous: Brains, Brawn, and the Evolution of Human Bipedalism,” in *In the Light of Evolution: Essays from the Laboratory and Field* (Greenwood Village, CO: Roberts and Company, 2011).

The area he lived in: Ibid.

The ancestors of *Homo erectus*: Rose, “A Hominine Hip Bone.”

Several millennia later: Ibid.

He was there as a member: Carol Broderick, “Fossil Finders: The Hominid Gang,” Leakey Foundation, May 31, 2019, <https://leakeyfoundation.org/fossil-finders-hominid-gang/>.

Ngeneo trained his keen eye: R. E. Leakey, “New Hominid Fossils from the Koobi Fora Formation in Northern Kenya,” *Nature* 261, no. 5561 (July 17, 1976): 574–76.

It was Dr. Daniel Lieberman: I originally reported this section about the biology of human running, the purpose of the butt muscles, and the Man Against Horse Race for WNYC’s *Radiolab*. A version of this section can be heard in the show “Man Against Horse,” which aired December 27, 2019. For the show, Matt Kielty and I interviewed Daniel Lieberman and Dennis Bramble and attended the race. I’ve used those interviews and experiences as sources for this section as well. We also interviewed several of the riders and runners, including Nick Courty.

Instead, it was a question: Daniel E. Lieberman et al., “The Human Gluteus Maximus and Its Role in Running,” *Journal of Experimental Biology* 209, no. 11 (April 1, 2006): 2143–55.

Biologists understood human running: Dennis M. Bramble and Daniel E. Lieberman, “Endurance Running and the Evolution of Homo,” *Nature* 432, no. 7015 (November 18, 2004): 345–52.

Because it's impossible: Ibid.

Usain Bolt: N. C. Sharp, "Animal Athletes: A Performance Review," *Veterinary Record* 171, no. 4 (2012): 87–94.

an antelope or a horse: Ibid.

They'd both read: David R. Carrier et al., "The Energetic Paradox of Human Running and Hominid Evolution" (including comments and reply), *Current Anthropology* 25, no. 4 (1984): 483–95.

Bramble and Lieberman: Collecting and storing human remains has a long and upsetting history that is deeply tied to the legacies of colonialism and scientific racism, as will be discussed at length in the next chapter. Although the bones that Lieberman and Bramble were looking at were Paleolithic, and in many ways fall into a different category of collecting than the human remains of Sarah Baartman, natural history collections are often housed at Western institutions like Harvard and collected as part of a larger colonial project in, as is the case here, Africa.

Homo erectus was the first: William J. Cromie, "Running Paced Human Evolution: Anthropologists Conclude Running May Have Helped Build a Bigger Brain," *Harvard Gazette*, November 18, 2004, <https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2004/11/running-paced-human-evolution/>.

It was also: Bramble and Lieberman, "Endurance Running and the Evolution of Homo."

He closely examined: Lieberman et al., "Human Gluteus Maximus."

If you look at the butt: Daniel Lieberman appeared on an episode of *The Colbert Report* that aired on Comedy Central on May 28, 2013.

our gluteus maximus is the biggest muscle: Andreu Llamas, *Muscles and Bones (Human Body)* (Milwaukee: Gareth Stevens Publications, 1998).

Like the whites of our eyes: Hiromi Kobayashi and Shiro Kohshima, "Unique Morphology of the Human Eye," *Nature* 387, no. 6635 (June 19, 1997): 767–768, <https://doi.org/10.1038/42842>.

Do you feel it: Daniel Lieberman on *The Colbert Report*.

the runners would climb 1,700: Ron Barrett provided me with elevation and course maps, and they are also available on the Man Against Horse website: <https://managainsthorse.net/>.

never been a human runner: Information on human endurance and running comes from my interviews with Lieberman and Bramble as well as the following scientific papers: Bramble and Lieberman, "Endurance Running and the Evolution of Homo"; Losos and Lieberman, "Four Legs Good"; Lieberman et al., "Human Gluteus Maximus"; and Dennis Bramble, "How Running Made Us Human: Endurance Running Let Us Evolve to Look the Way We Do," *Nature*, 432, no. 7015, November 18, 2004.

The human butt muscles: Information in this paragraph and the paragraph above specifically comes from Lieberman et al., "Human Gluteus Maximus."

a breastfeeding mother would have: Losos and Lieberman, "Four Legs Good," 15.

Dennis Bramble: This information comes from my interview with Dennis Bramble and his article "How Running Made Us Human."

Another group of scientists: Information in this section comes from my interviews with Jamie L. Bartlett, as well as Jamie L. Bartlett et al., "Activity and Functions of the Human Gluteal Muscles in Walking, Running, Sprinting, and Climbing," *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 153, no. 1 (November 12, 2013): 124–31.

One point nine million years ago: Information in this paragraph comes from Losos and Lieberman, "Four Legs Good."

He feels euphoric: This information comes from my interview with Daniel E. Lieberman and is also available in Gretchen Reynolds's article "The Evolution of the Runner's High," *New York Times*, April



25, 2012, <https://well.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/04/25/the-evolution-of-the-runners-high/>.  
*the first human in Man Against Horse*: The results for all the Man Against Horse Races are available at <https://managainsthorse.net/result.html>. The Man Against Horse Race, like all official endurance rides, includes vet checks for the horses where the horses stop, rest, and are checked by veterinarians. These times are subtracted from the horse's final time. Nick Coury was the first human to beat all the horses with the vet check holds subtracted from their times.

## FAT

*A soft tissue*: This information comes from my interview with Daniel E. Lieberman.

*We do know, however*: The information in this paragraph comes from my interview with Duke postdoctoral associate Devjane Swain-Lenz, as well as Devjane Swain-Lenz et al., "Comparative Analyses of Chromatin Landscape in White Adipose Tissue Suggest Humans May Have Less Beigeing Potential Than Other Primates," *Genome Biology and Evolution* 11, no. 7 (June 24, 2019): 1997–2008.

*According to Morgan Hoke*: Information in this paragraph comes primarily from my interview with assistant professor of anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania Morgan Hoke.

*This was necessary*: Losos and Lieberman, "Four Legs Good."

*Although all people need fat*: Information in this section comes from my interview with Morgan Hoke.

*Studies say the lowest*: George A. Bray and Claude Bouchard, eds., *Handbook of Obesity*, vol. 1, *Epidemiology, Etiology, and Physiopathology* (Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2014).

*For men, that number is*: Devi Swain-Lenz also discussed this with me during our interview.

*Pregnancy requires*: The information here also comes from my interview with Morgan Hoke.

*The most straightforward*: This information comes from my interview with Daniel E. Lieberman.

*There is also a body of research*: Information in this paragraph comes from my interview with Morgan Hoke.

## FEATHERS

*"The sight of a feather in"*: This quotation comes from a letter Charles Darwin wrote to Asa Gray on April 3, 1860. This letter can be found in Charles Darwin, *The Correspondence of Charles Darwin*, eds. Frederick Burkhardt et al. (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

*Darwin's theory of natural selection*: Dr. Chris Haufe explained the theories in this paragraph to me in a series of interviews that I conducted in the fall of 2021. However, the theories and questions around natural selection, sexual selection, and ornamentation are spelled out in many of Darwin's works, particularly *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*. I relied on Richard Prum's *The Evolution of Beauty: How Darwin's Forgotten Theory of Mate Choice Shapes the Animal World—and Us* (New York: Anchor Books, 2017) to understand these theories further, as well as conversations with Prum, Lieberman, and Kathryn Tabb, assistant professor of philosophy at Bard College.

*but you'll also find them referenced*: Of course, there are many publications that use evolutionary psychology to explain pop culture phenomena, but here are some examples of evolutionary psychology in *Maxim* and *Cosmopolitan*: Zeynep Yenisey, "New Study Claims to Show Why 'Gentlemen Prefer Blondes,'" *Maxim*, January 7, 2019, <https://www.maxim.com/news/men-prefer-blonde-women-study-2019-1/>; Zeynep Yenisey, "Why We Love to Hate Villains, According to Science," *Maxim*, December 2, 2015, <https://www.maxim.com/entertainment/why-we-love-to-hate-villains-2015-12/>;

Ali Drucker, "What Do Men and Women Each Regret Most about Sex?," *Maxim*, September 10, 2015, <https://www.maxim.com/maxim-man/what-do-men-and-women-each-regret-most-about-sex-study-2015-9/>; Meehika Barua, "The Scientific Reason Why Men Ghost You \*Exactly\* After Three Months," *Cosmopolitan*, May 11, 2021, <https://www.cosmopolitan.com/sex-love/a36395867/why-men-ghost-after-three-months/>; Zoe Ruderman, "The Move That Makes You Guy-Hot," *Cosmopolitan*, November 29, 2010, <https://www.cosmopolitan.com/sex-love/news/a8944/tilted-head-makes-women-attractive-study/>. Some of the studies cited by *Maxim*, *Cosmopolitan*, and Reddit include: Jens Kjeldgaard-Christiansen, "Evil Origins: A Darwinian Genealogy of the Popcultural Villain," *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences* 10, no. 2 (2016): 109–22; Andrew Galperin et al., "Sexual Regret: Evidence for Evolved Sex Differences," *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 42, no. 7 (November 12, 2012): 1145–61; David C. Matz and Verlin B. Hinsz, "Women's Hair as a Cue to Desired Relationship and Parenting Characteristics," *Journal of Social Psychology* 158, no. 5 (2018): 558–73; Peter Marshall, Amy Bartolacci, and Darren Burke, "Human Face Tilt Is a Dynamic Social Signal That Affects Perceptions of Dimorphism, Attractiveness, and Dominance," *Evolutionary Psychology* 18, no. 1 (January 1, 2020).

long Reddit threads: Again, there are many examples of evolutionary psychology on Reddit, but one thread where it is easily found is "Evolutionary Psychology / Sociobiology," <https://www.reddit.com/r/evopsych/>. One study cited in this thread is Rafael Wlodarski and Robin I. Dunbar, "What's in a Kiss? The Effect of Romantic Kissing on Mate Desirability," *Evolutionary Psychology* 12, no. 1 (January 1, 2014).

"High Heels Do Have": Thomas Anderson, "High Heels Do Have Power over Men, Study Finds," *Boston Globe*, December 8, 2014, <https://www.bostonglobe.com/news/world/2014/12/08/high-heels-have-power-over-men-study-finds/GaOqm3zuAgyrKGcZYzdTSM/story.html?event=event25>.

"How Make-up Makes Men": University of Stirling, "How Make-up Makes Men Admire but Other Women Jealous," *ScienceDaily*, [www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/06/160624155151.htm](http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/06/160624155151.htm).

high heels compel a woman: Farid Pazhoohi et al., "Arching the Back (Lumbar Curvature) as a Female Sexual Proceptivity Signal: An Eye-Tracking Study," *Evolutionary Psychological Science* 4, no. 2 (October 25, 2017): 158–65.

"The Science of Why You're an Ass Man": Ali Eaves, "The Science of Why You're an Ass Man," *Men's Health*, September 10, 2014, <https://www.menshealth.com/sex-women/a19533624/why-youre-an-ass-man/>.

"How the Gluteus Became Maximus": Olga Khazan, "How the Gluteus Became Maximus," *Atlantic*, April 2, 2015, <https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2015/04/how-the-gluteus-became-maximus/389216/>.

"Science Has Finally Figured Out": Alanna Núñez, "Science Has Finally Figured Out Why Men Like Big Butts," *Cosmopolitan*, March 6, 2015, <https://www.cosmopolitan.com/entertainment/celebs/news/a37405/science-big-butts/>.

The experiment was conducted: David M. G. Lewis et al., "Lumbar Curvature: A Previously Undiscovered Standard of Attractiveness," *Evolution and Human Behavior* 36, no. 5 (September 2015): 345–50.

Paleontologist Stephen Jay Gould described: Stephen Jay Gould, "The Return of Hopeful Monsters," *Natural History* 86 (June 1, 1977): 22.

evolutionary psychologists often use: Both Richard Prum and Chris Haufe helped me to understand these critiques of evolutionary psychology, which run very deep among evolutionary biologists.

Another problem with evolutionary psychology: Amotz Zahavi, "Mate Selection—a Selection for a Handicap," *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 53, no. 1 (1975): pp. 205–214,

[https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193\(75\)90111-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-5193(75)90111-3).

*This may sound counterintuitive:* This information comes from my interview with Chris Haufe.

*This mode of thinking:* Stephen J. Gould and Richard C. Lewontin, “The Spandrels of San Marco and the Panglossian Paradigm: A Critique of the Adaptationist Programme,” *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London* 205, no. 1161 (September 21, 1979): 581–98.

*On a visit to the Peabody Museum:* I visited Dr. Prum at Yale in May 2019 as well as in February 2018 and conducted interviews with him there. The information here also comes from his book *The Evolution of Beauty: How Darwin’s Forgotten Theory of Mate Choice Shapes the Animal World—and Us* (New York: Anchor Books, 2017).

*But I’m not here to learn about feather pigmentation:* Information in this section comes from my interviews with Dr. Prum and from his book *The Evolution of Beauty*.

*In fact, Haufe takes Prum’s idea:* This information comes from my interview with Chris Haufe.

## LIFE

*Life:* The reconstruction of Sarah Baartman’s life in this chapter relied heavily on the work of Clifton Crais and Pamela Scully, who wrote the excellent *Sarah Baartman and the Hottentot Venus* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011), a work widely cited by Baartman scholars. In addition to Crais and Scully, I’ve also consulted the following texts for general information about Baartman’s life and legacy: Anne Fausto-Sterling, “Gender, Race, and Nation: The Comparative Anatomy of ‘Hottentot’ Women in Europe, 1815–1817,” in *Deviant Bodies: Critical Perspectives on Difference in Science and Popular Culture*, eds. Jennifer Terry and Jacqueline Urla (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999), 19–48; Natasha Gordon-Chipembere, *Representation and Black Womanhood: The Legacy of Sarah Baartman* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016); Janell Hobson, *Venus in the Dark: Blackness and Beauty in Popular Culture* (Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2018); Rachel Holmes, *The Hottentot Venus: The Life and Death of Sarah Baartman* (London: Bloomsbury, 2020); *The Life and Times of Sarah Baartman*, directed by Zola Maseko, Icarus Films, 1998; T. Denean Sharpley-Whiting, *Black Venus: Sexualized Savages, Primal Fears, and Primitive Narratives in French* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999); and Deborah Willis, ed., *Black Venus 2010: They Called Her “Hottentot”* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2010).

*Georges Cuvier was, among other things:* Although most biographies of Cuvier are in French, biographical details of Cuvier are widely available in encyclopedias and scientific histories of the nineteenth century. I relied on scientific encyclopedias from the University of Arizona and the University of California at Berkeley, as well as information in the Crais and Scully biography of Baartman. I also had conversations with philosophers of science Chris Haufe and Kathryn Tabb that helped me understand Cuvier in context.

*Her name was Sarah Baartman:* Saartjie is an Afrikaans name and the one that many used for Baartman during her lifetime. She wouldn’t come to be called Sarah until she was baptized in Manchester several years after she arrived in England. Although it is nearly impossible to know to what degree any part of her life was choice rather than coercion, it seems in that moment she chose the name Sarah for herself. So it is that name that many scholars choose to call her today. The -tjie suffix is a diminutive with two meanings. It is an endearment used between friends and suggests affection. But it also reduces the size of what it names and suggests enslavement, servitude, subordination. Throughout the history of South Africa, it has been used as a racist form of speech, a way for white people to indicate their authority over

Black people. In Baartman's case, there was also likely a mocking in the diminutive: a woman who was known primarily for her full body was being called small every time someone said her name.

*The Khoe were*: In some sources, this Indigenous group is called Khoekhoe, but in conversations with contemporary Khoe people, I was told this is the preferred spelling and the pronunciation is "Quay."

*which had become fascinated with butts in general*: This insight comes from Rachel Holmes's biography of Sarah Baartman, *The Hottentot Venus: The Life and Death of Sarah Baartman*.

*European Renaissance painting had also commonly represented women's butts*: Sabrina Strings, *Fearing the Black Body: The Racial Origins of Fat Phobia* (New York: New York University Press, 2019).

*there were fart clubs*: Edward Ward, *A Compleat and Humorous Account of All the Remarkable Clubs and Societies in the Cities of London and Westminster* (London: 1756), 31–32.

*a big-butt woman is merrily taking a bath*: James Gillray, "Sir Richard Worse-than-sly, exposing his wife's bottom;—o fye!," hand-colored etching, March 14, 1782, National Portrait Gallery, London.

*Baartman was wearing the same clothes*: Holmes, *Hottentot Venus*, 33.

*By the end of the summer*: Crais and Scully, *Sara Baartman and the Hottentot Venus*.

*"The Hottentot Venus just arrived from the interior of Africa"*: Holmes, *Hottentot Venus*, 33.

*exhibitions featuring albino children and so-called Siamese twins and giants*: For more information on the role of freak shows and human zoos in Europe and the United States, see Bernth Lindfors, *Early African Entertainments Abroad: From the Hottentot Venus to Africa's First Olympians* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2014).

*She wore no corset or underwear*: Lindfors, *Early African Entertainments Abroad*, 14.

*"She is dressed in a color as nearly resembling her skin as possible"*: "The Hottentot Venus," *Times* (London), November 26, 1810, 3.

*They very often had her smoke a pipe*: This was both a nod to the long-held stereotype of Khoe women as pipe smokers and a way to further mark Baartman as separate from the women in the crowd. It was rare for English women to smoke pipes at the time, and so this "othered" her in both a gendered and a racial way.

*Caesars would lead Baartman around the stage*: "Hottentot Venus," *Times* (London).

*"She frequently heaved deep sighs"*: Ibid.

*The audience was only too happy to believe Caesars*: Holmes, *Hottentot Venus*, 48.

*When abolitionist groups learned of the situation*: Macaulay worked as an overseer on a sugar plantation in Jamaica before coming to the cause of abolition. In his book on British abolition, *Bury the Chains: Prophets and Rebels in the Fight to Free an Empire's Slaves* (Boston: Mariner Books, 2006), Adam Hoschfield describes him as a priggish and somber evangelical. Along with many others, he actively fought for the abolition of the slave trade, which eventually passed in 1807.

*"a foreigner, and a female, too, in worse than Egyptian bondage"*: Holmes, *Hottentot Venus*, 59.

*"The Hottentot was produced like a wild beast"*: "The Hottentot Venus," *Times*.

*Her defenders—an abolitionist organization called the African Institution*: Holmes, *Hottentot Venus*, 62.

*She was shivering onstage*: Harvey Blume, *Africans on Stage: Studies in Ethnological Show Business* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999).

*Until she testified*: The trial transcript is available as an appendix in Martin J. S. Rudwick, *Georges Cuvier, Fossil Bones, and Geological Catastrophes: New Translations and Interpretations of the Primary Texts* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

*"whether she preferred either to return to"*: Crais and Scully, *Sara Baartman and the Hottentot Venus*, 100.

*"There are persons ready to take her"*: Holmes, *Hottentot Venus*, 62.

"was under no restraint, and she was happy in England": "The Hottentot Venus," *Examiner*, December 2, 1810, 768.

"The Venus Hottentot has changed owners": Crais and Scully, *Sara Baartman and the Hottentot Venus*, 127.

Cuvier and his colleagues argued: Holmes, *Hottentot Venus*, 85.

They asked to see Baartman's "organs of generation": Sadiah Qureshi, "Displaying Sara Baartman, the 'Hottentot Venus,'" *History of Science* 42 (June 1, 2004): 237–57.

"She kept her apron concealed": Rudwick, *Georges Cuvier, Fossil Bones, and Geological Catastrophes*.

"a closer relative of the great apes": Crais and Scully, *Sara Baartman and the Hottentot Venus*.

The white, Western understanding of women's butts: This information comes from my interview with Janell Hobson, professor of women's, gender, and sexuality studies at the University at Albany.

Janell Hobson, professor of women's, gender, and sexuality studies: Hobson is a Baartman scholar whose book *Venus in the Dark* and papers "The 'Batty' Politic: Toward an Aesthetic of the Black Female Body," *Hypatia* 18, no. 4 (2003): 87–105, and "Remnants of Venus: Signifying Black Beauty and Sexuality," *WSQ: Women's Studies Quarterly* 46, no. 1-2 (2018): 105–20, were formative to my understanding of Baartman's legacy. I spoke with Hobson twice in the spring of 2021.

"The law basically legitimized rape": Many scholars have written on this idea, including Jennifer L. Morgan, "Partus Sequitur Ventrem: Law, Race, and Reproduction in Colonial Slavery," *Small Axe: A Caribbean Journal of Criticism* 22, no. 1 (March 2018): 1–17, and Alys Eve Weinbaum, *Wayward Reproductions: Genealogies of Race and Nation in Transatlantic Modern Thought* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004).

Her likeness was featured: Willis, *Black Venus*, 2010.

she was satirized in pantomime: Untitled article, *Times* (London), January 10, 1811, 2.

As Sander Gilman, a historian: Sander Gilman's article "Black Bodies, White Bodies: Toward an Iconography of Female Sexuality in Late Nineteenth-Century Art, Medicine, and Literature," *Critical Inquiry* 12, no. 1 (1985), is a foundational piece of scholarship on Baartman and the way that nineteenth-century scientists racialized and sexualized the butt.

"Female sexuality [became] linked to the image of the buttocks": Gilman, "Black Bodies, White Bodies," 219.

Baartman wasn't the only large-butt Khoe woman: Lindfors, *Early African Entertainments Abroad*.

## LEGACY

In his 1853 book: Francis Galton, *Narrative of an Explorer in Tropical South Africa: Being an Account of a Visit to Damaraland in 1851*, 4th ed. (London: Ward, Lock & Co., 1891), 54.

"turning herself about to all points of the compass": Ibid.

Although it was primarily the butts of Khoe women: All the information about eugenics in this chapter comes from the following sources: I interviewed Alexandra Minna Stern, professor of history, American culture, and women's and gender studies, and associate dean for the humanities at the University of Michigan, about the history of eugenics and her book *Eugenic Nation: Faults and Frontiers of Better Breeding in Modern America* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2016). I also spoke with Kate O'Connor, PhD student in American culture at the University of Michigan, who studies the history and legacy of eugenic sterilization. In addition, I drew from Adam Cohen's book *Imbeciles: The Supreme Court, American Eugenics, and the Sterilization of Carrie Buck* (New York:



Penguin Press, 2017), and Lulu Miller's *Why Fish Don't Exist: A Story of Loss, Love, and the Hidden Order of Life* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2021).

*that white people of European descent were the most evolved species*: The information in these pages on classification of whiteness comes from Nell Painter's *The History of White People* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2011), a book that was foundational to my thinking about whiteness and race in this book.

*In 1836, Godey's hired an editor*: Sabrina Strings, *Fearing the Black Body: The Racial Origins of Fat Phobia* (New York: New York University Press, 2019).

*the butt had become a proxy*: Gilman, "Black Bodies, White Bodies," 219.

*This association between vulva and butt*: There are ways that the butt and the labia are still linked today. Perhaps the best example is with the peach emoji, which can be a way to represent either the butt or the labia, although it is most commonly associated with the butt.

*anthropologist Abele de Blasio advanced this association*: Ibid., 229.

*physician and reformer Havelock Ellis*: The information and quotes in these paragraphs come from Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, vol. 4 (Philadelphia: Butterworth-Heinemann, 1942). Sander Gilman also points to Ellis in his analysis in "Black Bodies, White Bodies."

*in the landmark 1927 Supreme Court decision* *Buck v. Bell*: In 1927, in an eight-to-one decision, the US Supreme Court ordered that Carrie Buck, whom it called feeble-minded, be sterilized under the 1924 Virginia Eugenical Sterilization Act. *Buck v. Bell* set a legal precedent that states could sterilize inmates of public institutions. The court argued that imbecility, epilepsy, and feeble-mindedness are hereditary, and that inmates should be prevented from passing these defects on to their children. Adam Cohen's *Imbeciles* discusses this case further.

*As the racial scientists of the nineteenth century*: This section about the repatriation of Sarah Baartman's remains comes from the Crais and Scully biography as well as Hershini Bhana Young, "Returning to Hankey: Sarah Baartman and Endless Repatriations," in *Illegible Will: Coercive Spectacles of Labor in South Africa and the Diaspora* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017), 29–72. I also relied on the following contemporaneous accounts: Suzanne Daley, "Exploited in Life and Death, South African to Go Home," *New York Times*, January 30, 2002, <https://www.nytimes.com/2002/01/30/world/exploited-in-life-and-death-south-african-to-go-home.html>; Obed Zilwa, "S. Africa Buries Remains of 'Sarah,'" AP News, August 9, 2002, <https://apnews.com/article/b92223d9da4a13252640e2340899ef1a>. In addition, I interviewed Nomusa Makhubu, associate professor of art history and visual culture at the University of Cape Town, about Baartman's legacy in South Africa and South African feminism.

## BIGNESS

*The effect was that the bustled woman*: Jessica Glasscock, "Nineteenth-Century Silhouette and Support," Metropolitan Museum of Art, October 2004, [https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/19sil/hd\\_19sil.htm](https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/19sil/hd_19sil.htm).

*"The existence of a man-made object"*: Jules David Prown, "Mind in Matter: An Introduction to Material Culture Theory and Method," *Winterthur Portfolio* 17, no. 1 (1982): 1–19.

*I expected the archives of the Victoria & Albert*: I visited the Victoria & Albert archive and museum in the summer of 2018. Information about the Victoria & Albert Museum and much of the information about historical fashion comes from their historical archives and collections.

*Wearing lots of petticoats*: Kat Eschner, “Although Less Deadly Than Crinolines, Bustles Were Still a Pain in the Behind,” *Smithsonian*, April 21, 2017.

*Enter the bustle*: Basic information on the bustle can be found in a number of places, including C. Willett and Phillis Cunnington, *The History of Underclothes* (New York: Dover, 2013); Karen Bowman, *Corsets and Codpieces: A History of Outrageous Fashion, from Roman Times to the Modern Era* (New York: Skyhorse Publishing, 2016); and Wendy Tomlinson, “All About the Bustle,” Grey Roots Museum & Archives, <https://greyroots.com/story/all-about-bustle>.

*the London Times was said to be*: Mary Vivian Hughes, *A London Child of the Seventies* (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), 84.

*There are also materialist theories*: The information in this paragraph comes from an interview with Edwina Ehrman, a curator at the Victoria & Albert.

*Another theory suggests*: Information in this paragraph comes primarily from an email exchange with fashion historian Heather McNaughton at Truly Victorian.

*The bell shape of a crinoline*: Glasscock, “Nineteenth-Century Silhouette and Support.”

*The day after my trek to the bustle archives*: Information in the rest of this section comes from my interviews with Edwina Ehrman at the Victoria & Albert.

*Previously, during the Renaissance*: This theory of Victorian underwear comes from Casey Finch, “‘Hooked and Buttoned Together’: Victorian Underwear and Representations of the Female Body,” *Victorian Studies* 34, no. 3 (1991): 337–63.

*“Bustles! What are bustles?”*: “A Short Chapter on Bustles,” *Irish Penny Journal* 1, no. 18 (October 31, 1840): 140–41.

*In 1814, when Baartman*: The history of Sarah Baartman and the “Hottentot Venus” in this chapter comes primarily from my interviews with Janell Hobson; Holmes, *Hottentot Venus*; and Crais and Scully, *Sara Baartman and the Hottentot Venus*.

*The Hottentot Venus; or, The Hatred of Frenchwomen*: Emmanuel Théaulon de Lambert, Achille d’Artois, and Nicolas Brazier, *The Hottentot Venus; or, The Hatred of Frenchwomen*, November 19, 1814.

*“everything but the burden”*: Greg Tate et al., *Everything but the Burden: What White People Are Taking from Black Culture* (New York: Broadway Books, 2003).

*In a 1991 interview with critic Lisa Jones*: Lisa Jones, “Venus Envy,” *Village Voice* 36, no. 28 (July 9, 1991): 36.

*It was mostly men*: Eschner, “Although Less Deadly Than Crinolines.”

*It was mostly women*: Nancy L. Green, “Women and Immigrants in the Sweatshop: Categories of Labor Segmentation Revisited,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 38, no. 3 (1996): 414.

*Enslaved people in the American South*: Madelyn Shaw, “Slave Cloth and Clothing Slaves: Craftsmanship, Commerce, and Industry,” *Journal of Early Southern Decorative Arts*, 42, 2021.

*miners in Pennsylvania chiseled*: Arthur Cecil Bining, “The Iron Plantations of Early Pennsylvania,” *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 57, no. 2 (1933): 117–37.

## SMALLNESS

*When Gordon Conway*: All information in the following section about Gordon Conway and her mother, Tommie Conway, comes from Raye Virginia Allen’s *Gordon Conway: Fashioning a New Woman* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997). In addition to offering an excellent biography of the

Conways, it also provides reproductions of many of Gordon Conway's illustrations, which are described throughout this section.

*As the stiff, cagelike crust of the bustle*: Glasscock, "Nineteenth-Century Silhouette and Support."

*they were flappers*: Unless otherwise noted, information about flappers in this chapter comes from Linda Simon, *Lost Girls: The Invention of the Flapper* (London: Reaktion Books, 2017), and Joshua Zeitz, *Flapper: A Madcap Story of Sex, Style, Celebrity, and the Women Who Made America Modern* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 2006).

*took hold with remarkable ferocity*: Anne Hollander, *Seeing Through Clothes* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 155–56.

*As one scholar put it*: Kenneth A. Yellis, "Prosperity's Child: Some Thoughts on the Flapper," *American Quarterly* 21, no. 1 (1969): 46.

*At the end of the nineteenth century*: Bruce McComiskey and Cynthia Ryan, *City Comp: Identities, Spaces, Practices* (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 2003).

*after decades of anxiety*: Bernarr Macfadden, *The Power and Beauty of Superb Womanhood* (New York: The Physical Culture Publications Co., 1901).

*It began with Paul Poiret*: Information about Poiret and Chanel can be found in Linda Simon's *Lost Girls* and Joshua Zeitz's *Flappers* in addition to Harold Koda and Andrew Bolton, "Paul Poiret (1879–1944)," The Costume Institute, September 2008, [https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/poir/hd\\_poir.htm](https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/poir/hd_poir.htm), and Hollander, *Seeing Through Clothes*, 156.

*"I waged war upon it"*: A well-known quote from Poiret that is quoted in Zeitz, *Flapper*, 150.

*In the 1925 article "Flapper Jane"*: Bruce Bliven, "Flapper Jane," *The New Republic*, September 9, 1925, <https://newrepublic.com/article/113130/bruce-bliven-interviews-flapper>.

*Others would describe those who*: Emily Spivack, "The History of the Flapper, Part 3: The Rectangular Silhouette," *Smithsonian*, February 19, 2013.

*For more than a century*: Hollander, *Seeing Through Clothes*, 155–56.

*She is also very much a woman in motion*: This idea also comes from Anne Hollander's *Seeing Through Clothes*.

*But even if the typical story of the buttless, fashionable*: Information in this paragraph comes from Valerie Steele's *The Corset: A Cultural History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), and her other book *Fashion and Eroticism: Ideals of Feminine Beauty from the Victorian Era Through the Jazz Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 1985.

*In a study from 1912*: "Dieting, Swaying, Hopping to Make Over the Hip Line," *Washington Post*, December 4, 1910.

*Bathroom scales*: Information regarding the study of women's perceptions of their body as well as popular body monitoring and dieting habits comes from Simon, *Lost Girls*, 205–6.

*referenced an imagined idea of Japan*: Nancy Hass, "How Japonisme Forever Changed the Course of Western Design," *New York Times*, February 11, 2021, <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/11/t-magazine/japonisme-paris-western-design.html>.

*The Japonisme phenomenon ballooned*: Adam Geczy, *Fashion and Orientalism: Dress, Textiles and Culture from the 17th to the 21st Century* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013), 134.

*"flat terrain of the cloth"*: Harold Koda and Richard Martin, "Orientalism: Visions of the East in Western Dress," The Costume Institute, October 2004, [https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/orie/hd\\_orie.htm](https://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/orie/hd_orie.htm).



In 1912, for example: This evening coat can be found at

<https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/156074>.

Page Act of 1875: The Page Act of 1875, Public Law 43-141, US Statutes at Large 18 (1875): 477–78.

arguably one of the most famous flappers: Information and analysis of Josephine Baker comes from the following sources: Mae Henderson and Charlene B. Regester, eds., *The Josephine Baker Critical Reader: Selected Writings on the Entertainer and Activist* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2017) (NB: I relied heavily on the introduction, written by Mae Henderson and Charlene B. Regester, and Michael Borshuk’s chapter “An Intelligence of the Body: Disruptive Parody Through Dance in the Early Performances of Josephine Baker”); Marcel Sauvage, *Les memoires de Josephine Baker* (Paris: Editions Correa, 1949); Jean-Claude Baker and Chris Chase, *Josephine: The Hungry Heart* (New York: Cooper Square Press, 2001), 7; Anne Anlin Cheng, *Second Skin: Josephine Baker and the Modern Surface* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2013).

“to find freedom”: Quote comes from *Josephine Baker: The First Black Superstar*, directed by Suzanne Phillips, BBC Four, aired July 9, 2009.

In the midtwenties, Paris was a hub for Black American artists and intellectuals: Information on Black Paris in the 1920s comes from the following sources: Brent Hayes Edwards, *The Practice of Diaspora: Literature, Translation, and the Rise of Black Internationalism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003); Tyler Stovall, *Paris Noir: African Americans in the City of Light* (North Charleston, SC: CreateSpace, 2012); and a talk by Richard Long in April 2014 about the Harlem Renaissance and Paris, which I accessed on YouTube at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cGJ9x\\_PK\\_pY&t=3307s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cGJ9x_PK_pY&t=3307s).

in New York City, flappers like: Simon, *Lost Girls*.

According to her memoir: Baker’s memoir was dictated to her friend Marcel Sauvage and is in French. I worked with a translator to read the cited section. Sauvage, *Memoires de Josephine Baker*.

“dancing with the hips”: Sauvage, *Memoires de Josephine Baker*.

In one account of the first performance: Quotes in this paragraph that describe the reaction to Baker’s performance come from Baker and Chase, *Josephine: The Hungry Heart*, 7.

In L’Art Vivant: Baker and Chase, *Josephine: The Hungry Heart*, 7.

“We’ve been hiding our butts”: This famous quote from Baker is often cited in translation from Phyllis Rose and Jazz Cleopatra, *Josephine Baker in Her Time* (New York: Vintage, 1991). I went to the original source, which is the memoir she wrote with Marcel Sauvage, and had a translator look at it again. The difference is slight but meaningful.

“Like Stravinsky’s The Rite of Spring”: *Josephine Baker: The First Black Superstar*.

There was even a Josephine Baker doll: Richard Long, lecture about the Harlem Renaissance and Paris.

“All of these moves that in the European”: *Josephine Baker: The First Black Superstar*.

## CREATION

Norma’s butt: I first learned about Norma and Normman in a conversation with Kate O’Connor, a PhD student at the University of Michigan doing work on the history of eugenics in that state. I’ve since consulted the following sources on the statues: Peter Cryle and Elizabeth Stephens, *Normality: A Critical Genealogy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018); Julian B. Carter, *The Heart of Whiteness: Normal Sexuality and Race in America, 1880–1940* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007); Dahlia S. Cambers, “The Law of Averages 1: Norman and Norma,” *Cabinet Magazine* 15 (2004); and Mary Coffey, “The Law of Averages 2: American Adonis,” *Cabinet Magazine* 15 (2004).

Joe Tait, archivist at the Cleveland Museum of Natural History, helped me unearth much of the primary source material in this chapter. I also spoke with Mary Coffey about her essay “American Adonis,” published in *Popular Eugenics: National Efficiency and American Mass Culture in the 1930s* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2006).

*twenty-nine inches across*: Measurements of Normman and Norma, 1943, Dickinson-Belskie Files, HealthSpace Cleveland Collection, Cleveland Museum of Natural History Archives, Cleveland, Ohio.

*If Birthing Series showed viewers*: Rose Holz, “The 1939 Dickinson-Belskie Birth Series Sculptures: The Rise of Modern Visions of Pregnancy, the Roots of Modern Pro-Life Imagery, and Dr. Dickinson’s Religious Case for Abortion,” *Papers in Women’s and Gender Studies* 9 (2017): 5,

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1010&context=womenstudiespapers>.

*a project of American eugenics*: As in chapter 2, all the information referring to eugenics in this section comes from the following sources: my interview with Alexandra Minna Stern, professor of history, American culture, and women’s and gender studies, and associate dean for the humanities at the University of Michigan, about the history of eugenics, and her book *Eugenic Nation: Faults and Frontiers of Better Breeding in Modern America* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2016). I also spoke with Kate O’Connor, PhD student in American culture at the University of Michigan, who studies the history and legacy of eugenic sterilization. In addition, I drew from Adam Cohen’s book *Imbeciles*, Lulu Miller’s *Why Fish Don’t Exist*, and Nell Painter’s *The History of White People*.

*Five years earlier*: Archivist Emily Marsh at the USDA archives wrote an article about O’Brien that is available on the archives’ website: Emily Marsh, “Apron Strings and Kitchen Sinks: The USDA Bureau of Home Economics,” US Department of Agriculture,

<https://www.nal.usda.gov/exhibits/ipd/apronsandkitchens/about>. I spoke with Marsh, and she pointed me to several primary sources about the study and helped to contextualize it in the broader history of home economics. For more information on the history of home economics, see Cornell University’s home economics archive: <https://digital.library.cornell.edu/collections/hearth/about>.

*“There are no standards”*: All the information in the following paragraphs regarding Ruth O’Brien come from her book *Women’s Measurements for Garment and Pattern Construction* (Washington, DC: US Department of Agriculture, 1941), 1–73. I primarily used the following chapters: “Foreword,” “Measuring Procedures,” and “The Schedule.”

*In his article about Norma and Normman*: Harry L. Shapiro, “A Portrait of the American People,” *Natural History* 54 (1945): 248,

<https://archive.org/details/naturalhistory54newy/page/248/mode/2up>.

*interviewed clergy*: Newspaper clipping of Josephine Robertson, “Church Interests Itself in Norma,” September 19, 1945, Dickinson-Belskie Files, 1945 Norma Contest scrapbook, HealthSpace Cleveland Collection, Cleveland Museum of Natural History Archives, Cleveland, Ohio.

*doctors*: Newspaper clipping of Josephine Robertson, “Norma’s Husband Better Be Good,” September 15, 1945, Dickinson-Belskie Files, 1945 Norma Contest scrapbook, HealthSpace Cleveland Collection, Cleveland Museum of Natural History Archives, Cleveland, Ohio.

*educators*: Newspaper clipping of Josephine Robertson, “Norma’s Gym Suit in ’90s Covered All,” September 12, 1945, Dickinson-Belskie Files, 1945 Norma Contest scrapbook, HealthSpace Cleveland Collection, Cleveland Museum of Natural History Archives, Cleveland, Ohio.

*“typical American girl”*: Newspaper clipping of Josephine Robertson, “Our ‘Norma’ Is Larger Than Her Grandma,” 1945, Dickinson-Belskie Files, 1945 Norma Contest scrapbook, HealthSpace Cleveland Collection, Cleveland Museum of Natural History Archives, Cleveland, Ohio.

*talked to artists*: Newspaper clipping of Josephine Robertson, “Norma Is Appealing Model in Opinion of City’s Artists,” September 15, 1945, Dickinson-Belskie Files, 1945 Norma Contest scrapbook, HealthSpace Cleveland Collection, Cleveland Museum of Natural History Archives, Cleveland, Ohio.

*physical fitness instructors*: Newspaper clipping of Robertson, “Norma’s Gym Suit in ’90s Covered All.”

*who belonged inside the category of normal*: Although eugenicists were often invested in theories that situated white people as higher than Black and Asian people in a racial hierarchy, their primary racial interest was in policing whiteness itself. As described in the previous chapter, there were myriad ways that scientists classified and ranked people from different parts of the world whom we would call white today. In many of these systems, those considered “less white” were considered more likely to be criminals or feeble-minded, and so the eugenic justification for being suspicious of these groups was part of the larger project of ridding the world of criminality and disability.

*The form published by the newspaper*: Newspaper clipping of Robertson, “Norma Is Appealing Model.”

*Some women measured themselves at home*: Newspaper clippings of tips on how to measure yourself for Norma Contest, September 10, 1945, Dickinson-Belskie Files, 1945 Norma Contest scrapbook, HealthSpace Cleveland Collection, Cleveland Museum of Natural History Archives, Cleveland, Ohio.

*On the last day of the contest alone*: Newspaper clipping of Josephine Robertson, “3,700 Send Measurements in Ohio Search for Norma,” September 20, 1945, Dickinson-Belskie Files, 1945 Norma Contest scrapbook, HealthSpace Cleveland Collection, Cleveland Museum of Natural History Archives, Cleveland, Ohio.

*The following day, the forty entrants*: Newspaper clipping of Josephine Robertson, “Theater Cashier, 23, Wins Title of ‘Norma,’ Besting 3,863 Entries,” September 23, 1945, Dickinson-Belskie Files, 1945 Norma Contest scrapbook, HealthSpace Cleveland Collection, Cleveland Museum of Natural History Archives, Cleveland, Ohio,

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1QVkJZOQPvytkw8YQufOhmQv0Bg7eM048R/view>.

*The woman who came the closest*: Ibid.

## PROLIFERATION

*For all its power and staggering profits*: I have previously researched the history of sizes as part of an article I wrote for the *Paris Review* on *Jumpsuit*, an art project created by the Rational Dress Society (Heather Radke, “The Jumpsuit That Will Replace All Clothes Forever,” *Paris Review*, March 21, 2018, <https://www.theparisreview.org/blog/2018/03/21/the-jumpsuit-that-will-replace-all-clothes-forever/>). One of the co-creators of *Jumpsuit*, Abigail Glaum-Lathbury, also helped me understand the history of size in a series of interviews I conducted specifically for this chapter. Additionally, I looked at Julia Felsenthal, “A Size 2 Is a Size 2 Is a Size 8,” *Slate*, January 25, 2012, <https://slate.com/culture/2012/01/clothing-sizes-getting-bigger-why-our-sizing-system-makes-no-sense.html>; Laura Stampler, “The Bizarre History of Clothing Sizes,” *Time*, October 23, 2014, <https://time.com/3532014/women-clothing-sizes-history/>; and Gimlet Media, “When Did Pants Become a Thing?,” *Every Little Thing* podcast, April 8, 2019, <https://gimletmedia.com/shows/every-little-thing/n8hw4d>. I also consulted Sarah-Grace Heller, *A Cultural History of Dress and Fashion in the Medieval Age* (London, England: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018).

*a truly monumental shift*: Alli Farago, “The Textile Industry During the Industrial Revolution,” globalEDGE, October 18, 2017, <https://globaledege.msu.edu/blog/post/54483/the-textile-industry-during-the-industrial-revolution>.

*Wealthy women hired*: Ava Baron and Susan E. Klepp, “If I Didn’t Have My Sewing Machine...’: Women and Sewing Machine Technology,” in *A Needle, a Bobbin, a Strike: Women Needleworkers in America*, eds. Joan M. Jensen and Sue Davidson (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2018), and “History of Sweatshops: 1880–1940,” National Museum of American History, August 9, 2021, <https://americanhistory.si.edu/sweatshops/history-1880-1940>.

*did not markedly improve*: Grace Rogers Cooper, *The Sewing Machine: Its Invention and Development* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1976), 57–58.

*they often call on one in particular*: In addition to Abigail’s interviews, I’ve looked at the following sources to better understand the way contemporary sizing works: Suzanne Kapner, “It’s Not You. Clothing Sizes Are Broken,” *Wall Street Journal*, December 16, 2019, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/its-not-you-clothing-sizes-are-broken-11576501384>; and Daniel Soyer, “Garment Sweatshops, Then and Now,” *New Labor Forum* 4 (1999): 35–46.

*Natasha Wagner, one of the fashion industry’s most in-demand denim fit models*: I interviewed Wagner in September 2020 and all of the biographical information comes from that interview, as does the information about the process that is used for fit models. I have confirmed these facts with Glaum-Lathbury as well. Natasha Wagner has been featured in several fashion outlets, including *Vogue* (Olivia Fleming, “Meet the Model Whose Bottom Is Shaping a Nation,” *Vogue*, June 29, 2015, <https://www.vogue.com/article/best-jeans-butt-model-natasha-wagner>), Refinery29 (Liza Darwing, “This Denim Model Literally Has the Best Butt in the Business,” Refinery29, June 30, 2015, <https://www.refinery29.com/en-us/2015/06/90010/jeans-model-natasha-wagner>), and WNYC (Jenna Flanagan, “Fashion Fit Models: Rarely Seen but Essential to the Runway,” WNYC, February 17, 2011, <https://www.wnyc.org/story/115002-behind-stage-fashion-week-fit-models/>). I’ve drawn on these sources, as well as an interview with Wagner, for this section.

*“If you fit with someone who is too curvy”*: Fleming, “Meet the Model.”

## RESISTANCE

*Like almost everything else I encountered*: I attended the Iconic Drag Competition in the fall of 2019 on the recommendation of Vincent Cuccia and Alex Bartlett of Planet Pepper.

*On a hot July day in 2019*: I interviewed Cuccia and Bartlett in 2019, and the interviews I used in this section were conducted in their apartment.

*But femininity is not a singular experience*: The analysis of gender and drag in these paragraphs comes from decades of work done by scholars including Judith Butler, José Esteban Muñoz, and Jack Halberstam. I audited a class with Halberstam in 2019 to help round out my knowledge on queer performance and have drawn on what I learned in that class both here and in other sections of the book.

*“One is not born, but rather becomes, woman”*: Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, trans. Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier (London: Vintage Classics, 2011), 330.

*gender as a construction and a performance, rather than as a stable fact*: Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (Oxfordshire: Routledge Classics, 2006).

## STEEL

*In the first panel of a comic strip from 1994*: Jack Ohman, “Mixed Media,” *Denver Post*, May 18, 1984.

It was spoofed on Saturday Night Live: Brenda Herrman, “Buns of Steel,” *Chicago Tribune*, February 23, 1993.

It took me six months to track Greg Smithey down: The biographical information about Greg Smithey comes primarily from interviews with him I conducted in August 2020. As mentioned, some of the stories and facts about his life weren’t possible to verify, but I’ve done my best to confirm his story when possible.

he claims he trained Sarah Palin: I couldn’t find any evidence on this either way.

According to the website he maintains now: The website Smithey currently maintains is <http://www.originalbunssteelvd.com/>. *The Original Buns of Steel* is available for purchase there and also readily available on YouTube.

Throughout the 1960s and ’70s: The information about the history of exercise before 1970 came from my interview with New School professor Natalia Petrzela in June 2020 and Jonathan Black, *Making the American Body: The Remarkable Saga of the Men and Women Whose Feats, Feuds, and Passions Shaped Fitness History* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2013), 39.

By the late 1970s: The idea that the rise of neoliberalism changed the way many Americans thought about their bodies is a fairly common one that comes up in many histories of exercise and came up in my conversation with Dr. Petrzela. It is a complex and difficult thing to define neoliberalism, but I’ve done my best here with the help of the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* and David Harvey’s *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

in 1968, an air force physician: Kenneth H. Cooper, *Aerobics* (Lanham, Maryland: M. Evans, 1968).

Until that point, most Americans associated: Information on and analysis of the history of aerobics comes primarily from Cooper’s *Aerobics* and also Black, *Making the American Body*; Elizabeth Kagan and Margaret Morse, “The Body Electronic: Aerobic Exercise on Video: Women’s Search for Empowerment and Self-Transformation,” *TDR* 32, no. 4 (1988): 164–80; Claire Elaine Rasmussen, “Fit to Be Tied,” in *The Autonomous Animal Self-Governance and the Modern Subject* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), 137–66; Jenny Ellison, “Not Jane Fonda: Aerobics for Fat Women Only,” in *The Fat Studies Reader*, eds. Esther Rothblum and Sondra Solovay (New York: New York University Press, 2009), 312–19; and interviews with Natalia Petrzela.

Jane Fonda, the daughter of screen icon Henry Fonda: Biographical information about Jane Fonda is readily available in many places, including her own memoir. One of the best sources is the documentary *Jane Fonda in Five Acts*, a 2018 film directed by Susan Lacy and released by HBO. Information on Jane Fonda and her work as an aerobics icon also comes from the sources listed above on the history of aerobics.

as part of a fundraising effort for the Campaign for Economic Democracy: Robert Lindsey, “Jane Fonda’s Exercise Salons Aiding Her Husband’s Candidacy,” *New York Times*, May 2, 1982, 24.

Jane Fonda’s Workout Book: Jane Fonda and Steve Schapiro, *Jane Fonda’s Workout Book* (London, England: Allen Lane/Penguin Press, 1981).

“a spit and a prayer”: This quote comes from *Jane Fonda in Five Acts*.

“an Alaska feel”: Linda Sievers, “Videos to Sweat by Offer Convenient Way to Work,” *Anchorage Daily News*, January 15, 1998.

Maier found just that in Tamilee Webb: The biographical information about Tamilee Webb comes primarily from an interview with her I conducted in June 2020.

It is a fantasy of both hyper-responsibility: Kagan and Morse, “The Body Electronic,” 167, 173–74.



## JOY

*When I asked Rosezella Canty-Letsome*: The life histories of Rosezella Canty-Letsome and Deb Burgard come from interviews I conducted with them as part of my research in May and March 2020, respectively. Additionally, Jenny Ellison, curator of sport and leisure at the Canadian Museum of History, told me about the fat fitness movement in the Bay Area in an interview with her. I also consulted her scholarship on the subject: “Not Jane Fonda,” 312–19, and “Fat Activism and Physical Activity,” in *Routledge Handbook of Critical Obesity Studies*, eds. Michael Gard, Darren Powell, and José Tenorio (London: Routledge, 2021), helped to put that movement in a broader context.

*In Great Shape, a fitness guide for large women*: Deb Burgard and Pat Lyons, *Great Shape: The First Exercise Guide for Large Women* (New York: Arbor House, 1988).

*attracted national media attention*: Marilyn Schwartz, “The ‘Plump and Proud’ Crowd Is Having Its Day in a Big Way,” *Houston Chronicle*, March 27, 1987, and Jane E. Brody, “HEALTH; Personal Health,” *New York Times*, September 8, 1988, sec. B, p. 12.

## KATE

*in 1991, Moss shot*: Calvin Klein, Calvin Klein Jeans advertisement, 1991.

*“I didn’t want these girls”*: Klein’s quotes are from George Wayne, “Calvin Klein,” *IRIS Covet Book*, 2017.

*In the late nineteenth century, the sickly, tubercular body*: Susan Sontag’s “Illness as Metaphor” offers a full accounting of the many ways tuberculosis, and later cancer, became linked to morality and aesthetics. For more information, see Susan Sontag, *Illness as Metaphor* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1978).

*“When I was young, I could not have accepted”*: The quote from poet Théophile Gautier and more information on the culture of consumption and sickness in poetry can be found in David M. Moran, “At the Deathbed of Consumptive Art,” *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 8, no. 11 (2002): 1353–58, doi:10.3201/eid0811.020549.

*and sparked headlines like*: Louise Lague, “How Thin Is Too Thin?,” *People*, September 20, 1993, <https://people.com/archive/cover-story-how-thin-is-too-thin-vol-40-no-12/>; Mark Henderson, “Heroin: A Model Way to Die,” *Sunday Star-Times* (New Zealand), June 15, 1997; John Leo, “The Perfect Embodiment of Degraded Pop Culture,” *Seattle Times*, June 7, 1994, <https://archive.seattletimes.com/archive/?date=19940607&slug=1914393>.

*in 1997, President Bill Clinton publicly decried*: Christopher S. Wren, “Clinton Calls Fashion Ads’ ‘Heroin Chic’ Deplorable,” *New York Times*, May 22, 1997, <https://www.nytimes.com/1997/05/22/us/clinton-calls-fashion-ads-heroin-chic-deplorable.html>.

*When Moss posed with Mark Wahlberg in a Calvin Klein underwear ad*: Herb Ritts, *Kate Moss & Mark Wahlberg*—Calvin Klein, photograph, 1992.

## MIX

*2. Mix*: I consulted the following sources on the history of hip-hop, women and hip-hop, and the butt in hip-hop for this chapter: Jeff Chang, *Can’t Stop Won’t Stop: A History of the Hip-Hop Generation* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2007); Margaret Hunter and Kathleen Soto, “Women of Color in Hip Hop: The Pornographic Gaze,” *Race, Gender & Class* 16, no. 1-2 (2009): 170–91; Joan Morgan, “Fly-Girls,

Bitches, and Hoes: Notes of a Hip-Hop Feminist,” *Social Text* 45 (1995): 151–57; Evelyn McDonnell, “The Booty Myth,” *Medium*, November 10, 2014, <https://medium.com/cuepoint/the-booty-myth-5d524c2ab49d>; Janell Hobson, “The ‘Batty’ Politic: Toward an Aesthetic of the Black Female Body,” *Hypatia* 18, no. 4 (2003): 87–105; Julia S. Jordan-Zachery, “Inscribing and the Black (Female) Body Politic,” in *Shadow Bodies* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2017), 30–51; Bettina L. Love, “Body Image, Relationships, Desirability, and Ass,” *Counterpoints* 399 (2012): 78–87; Tricia Rose, “Black Texts/Black Contexts,” in *Poetry and Cultural Studies: A Reader* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2009, 2009), 194.

“Oh—my—God, Becky, look at her butt”: Sir Mix-A-Lot, “Baby Got Back,” 1992, music video, 4:13.

“There was one event that was irritating the shit out of me”: All quotes by Anthony Ray (Sir Mix-A-Lot), Patti Galluzzi, Amy Dorsey-Rivas, and Adam Bernstein can be found in a 2013 *Vulture* interview with Anthony Ray et al.: Rob Kemp, “‘And I Cannot Lie’: The Oral History of Sir Mix-a-Lot’s ‘Baby Got Back’ Video,” *Vulture*, December 19, 2013, <https://www.vulture.com/2013/12/sir-mix-a-lot-baby-got-back-video-oral-history.html>.

both conservative groups like Tipper Gore’s: Research on the backlash to “Baby Got Back” by the PMRC and WAP uses Kory Grow, “PMRC’s ‘Filthy 15’: Where Are They Now?,” *Rolling Stone*, September 17, 2015, <https://www.rollingstone.com/music/music-lists/pmrcs-filthy-15-where-are-they-now-60601/>; Gavin M. Ratcliffe, “Parental Advisory, Explicit Content: Music Censorship and the American Culture Wars,” (honors paper, Oberlin College, 2016); and Christopher Swan, “MTV: Advertisers Carry the Clout. Under Fire for Snarl-and-Seduction Imagery, Producers Leaning Toward Less Threat, but More Flesh,” *Christian Science Monitor*, May 8, 1985, <https://www.csmonitor.com/1985/0508/lmtv2-f.html>.

“That video does not pass the Bechdel Test”: All quotes from Kyra Gaunt come from my phone interview with Kyra Gaunt (assistant professor of music and theater, University at Albany), August 6, 2020. For my research for this chapter and the next, I also relied on Gaunt’s scholarship, particularly Kyra D. Gaunt, “YouTube, Twerking & You: Context Collapse and the Handheld Co-presence of Black Girls and Miley Cyrus,” *Journal of Popular Music Studies* 27, no. 3 (2015): 244–73.

Politicians in the 1990s were also busily creating policy: Stephanie Cornish, “Welfare Reform Garnered for Black Women a Hard Time and a Bad Name,” *AFR: The Black Media Authority*, March 18, 2015, <https://www.afro.com/welfare-reform-garnered-for-black-women-a-hard-time-and-a-bad-name/>. The employment and wage gap statistics were found in Valerie Wilson and William M. Rodgers III, “Black-White Wage Gaps Expand with Rising Wage Inequality,” Economic Policy Institute, September 20, 2016, <https://www.epi.org/publication/black-white-wage-gaps-expand-with-rising-wage-inequality/>, and Callie M. Rennison and Sarah Welchans, “Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report: Intimate Partner Violence,” US Department of Justice, last updated January 31, 2002, <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/ipv.pdf>.

But ethnomusicologist Christopher Smith: Christopher Smith, *Dancing Revolution: Bodies, Space, and Sound in American Cultural History* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2019), 148.

“a powerfully physical, visible, and independent”: In his section of *Dancing Revolution* titled “Street Dance and Freedom,” Smith elaborates, describing the “Baby Got Back” video as “racially empowering... to dance together, to dance a community into existence—if only, as Christopher Small put it, ‘for the duration of the performance’—is itself to participate in the invention and reinvention of human liberation.”

“Baby Got Back” was number one on the Billboard Hot 100: “The Hot 100,” *Billboard*, August 1, 1992, <https://www.billboard.com/charts/hot-100/1992-08-01/>. The *Billboard* statistics are cited in Stephen

J. Horowitz, "Sir Mix-A-Lot on 'Baby Got Back,' the Song of the Summer 25 Years Ago," *Billboard*, May 25, 2017, <https://www.billboard.com/articles/news/magazine-feature/7809400/sir-mix-a-lot-on-baby-got-back/>, and Michael Ellis, "Top 100 Singles Spotlight," *Billboard*, July 11, 1992.

*stayed on the charts for seven months*: "Baby Got Back" remained in the number one spot on the *Billboard* Hot 100 list from the week of July 4, 1992, to the week of August 1, 1992, before losing its place to "This Used to Be My Playground" by Madonna.

*surpassed only by one of the bestselling songs of all time*: Statistics on Houston's "I Will Always Love You" can be found at Gary Trust, "Ask Billboard: Is 'I Will Always Love You' the Most Enduring Hit of the Rock Era?," *Billboard*, October 4, 2016, <https://www.billboard.com/articles/columns/chart-beat/7533218/ask-billboard-is-i-will-always-love-you-the-most-enduring-hit-of>.

*the song has earned more than one hundred million dollars*: The one hundred million dollars figure is from an interview conducted with Sir Mix-A-Lot, interview by DJ Vlad, VladTV.com, <https://www.vladtv.com/article/261264/sir-mix-a-lot-explains-how-publishing-beats-out-royalties-flashback>.

*climbed to number two on the Billboard Hot 100*: As per the November 1992 *Billboard* chart, "Rump Shaker" reached the top of the charts: "Hot Rap Songs," *Billboard*, <https://www.billboard.com/charts/rap-song/1992-11-28>.

*thwarted by the mighty power of Whitney Houston's*: "Whitney Houston 'I Will Always Love You' #1 in 1992," Whitney Houston.com, December 9, 2016, <https://www.whitneyhouston.com/news/whitney-houston-i-will-always-love-you-1992/>.

*Sometimes one of them played a saxophone*: Wreckx-n-Effect Ft. Teddy Riley, "Rump Shaker," music video, originally published by Future Entertainment MCA, August 1992, 3:43. Found online at: <https://youtu.be/zdLvauICvPM>.

*"Rumps ain't dirty"*: Quotes from a 1992 interview with Teddy Riley: Dennis Hunt, "TEDDY RILEY and WRECKX-N-EFFECT: Shakin' Their Moneymakers," *Los Angeles Times*, November 29, 1992, <https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-1992-11-29-ca-2538-story.html>.

*As Nasty as They Wanna Be: 2 Live Crew*, *As Nasty as They Wanna Be*, 1988, Luke/Atlantic Records 91651, 1989, compact disc.

*including the 1990 song "Face Down Ass Up"*: 2 Live Crew, "Face Down Ass Up," track 3 on *Live in Concert*, Effect/Luke Records, 1990, live album.

*"2 Live Crew is engaged in heavy-handed parody"*: Henry L. Gates, "2 Live Crew, Decoded," *New York Times*, June 19, 1990, <https://www.nytimes.com/1990/06/19/opinion/2-live-crew-decoded.html>.

*jumping two Nielsen points in the first week*: McGrath, Tom, *MTV: The Making of a Revolution* (Philadelphia: Running Press, 1996).

*"It put us on the same page as rock 'n' roll and music in general"*: Jacob Hoyer, David P. Levin, and Stuart Cohn, *MTV Uncensored* (New York: Pocket Books, 2001), 98.

## JENNIFER

*Jennifer Lopez's butt*: I used the following sources while conducting my research on Jennifer Lopez: Wendy A. Burns-Ardolino, "Jiggle in My Walk," in *The Fat Studies Reader* (New York: New York University Press, 2009), 271–79; Mary Beltrán, "The Hollywood Latina Body as Site of Social Struggle: Media Constructions of Stardom and Jennifer Lopez's 'Cross-over Butt,'" *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* 19, no. 1 (2002): 71–86; Magdalena Barrera, "Hottentot 2000: Jennifer Lopez and Her Butt,"



*Sexualities in History: A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 411–17; Priscilla Peña Ovalle, “Jennifer Lopez, Racial Mobility, and the New Urban/Latina Commodity,” in *Dance and the Hollywood Latina* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010), 126–44; Elena Romero, “The Butt Remix: Beauty, Pop Culture, Hip Hop, and the Commodification of the Black Booty,” *QED: A Journal in GLBTQ Worldmaking* 4, no. 3 (2017): 190–94.

*“If you’re raised in this country, since childhood”*: Frances Negrón-Muntaner, “Jennifer’s Butt,” *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies* 22, no. 2 (1997): 181–94.

*“Jennifer’s Butt”*: Ibid.

*“Todo eso es tuyo?”*: Mary C. Beltrán, *Latina/o Stars in U.S. Eyes: The Making and Meanings of Film and TV Stardom* (Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 2009), 138.

*Premiere declared “Jennifer Lopez’s ass”*: The interviews with Jennifer Lopez were described in Beltrán, *Latina/o Stars in US Eyes: The Making and Meanings of Film and TV Stardom*, 138–45; Beltrán, “The Hollywood Latina Body”; and Joel Stein, “Interview with Jennifer Lopez,” *Time*, October 5, 1998, <http://content.time.com/time/subscriber/article/0,33009,989247,00.html>.

*In 2000, when she wore a revealing green jungle-print dress*: Rachel Tashjian, “How Jennifer Lopez’s Versace Dress Created Google Images,” *GQ*, September 20, 2019, <https://www.gq.com/story/jennifer-lopez-versace-google-images>.

*In her “Jenny from the Block” video*: Jennifer Lopez, “Jenny from the Block,” music video, 2002, 4:04, <https://youtu.be/dly6p4Fu5TE>.

*By the early aughts, they were running articles asking*: The various songs and articles I’m referring to can be found here: Peter Sheridan, “Jennifer Lopez, Bum Selfies and Butt Facials—Are Bottoms the New Boobs?” *Daily Express* (UK), September 23, 2014; Jessica Mehalic, “Bootylicious: Guys Talk Tail,” *Cosmopolitan*, (November 2001), 144–47.

*an abundant new crop of popular songs*: Sisqó, “Thong Song,” 1999, track 8 on *Unleash the Dragon*, Def Soul, February 15, 2000, compact disc; Black Eyed Peas, “My Humps,” 2004, track 5 on *Monkey Business*, A&M, September 27, 2005, compact disc.

*Department stores even began*: Belinda Luscombe, “When the Fantasy Is a Size 16: Retailers Introduce Voluptuous Mannequins,” *Time*, November 8, 2013, <https://healthland.time.com/2013/11/08/when-the-fantasy-is-a-size-16-retailers-introduce-voluptuous-mannequins/>; Reuters, “Big-Bottomed Mannequins Shake Their Booty,” *Today*, November 11, 2004, <https://www.today.com/popculture/big-bottomed-mannequins-shake-their-booty-wbna6462911>.

*the country was in the process of becoming less white*: The census statistics are from the 2000 and 1990 census data (available online from the US Census Bureau). Since the census publishes demographic information in individual reports, multiple reports were used to track the statistics for the growth of individual racial and ethnic groups in the United States between 1990 and 2000.

*a trend that would continue through 2010 and is projected to continue*: The data on the projected growth of the Hispanic population was found in Maria T. Mora, “The Increasing Importance of Hispanics to the US Workforce,” *Monthly Labor Review*, US Bureau of Labor Statistics, September 2015.

*but it did mean that corporate America became increasingly interested*: Robert E. Weems, *The Revolution Will Be Marketed: American Corporations and Black Consumers During the 1960s* (New York: New York University Press, 1998).

*In Hollywood, the financial successes of films*: *House Party*, directed by Reginald Hudlin, was released in 1990 by New Line Cinema; *Boyz n the Hood*, directed by John Singleton, was released in 1991 by

Columbia Pictures; *Waiting to Exhale*, directed by Forest Whitaker, was released in 1995 by 20th Century Fox.

*"The black population is younger, and is growing faster"*: Karen G. Bates, "They've Gotta Have Us," *New York Times*, July 14, 1991, <https://www.nytimes.com/1991/07/14/magazine/theyve-gotta-have-us.html>.

*Black characters on television also multiplied in the 1990s*: Riva Tukachinsky, Dana Mastro, and Moran Yarchi, "Documenting Portrayals of Race/Ethnicity on Primetime Television over a 20-Year Span and Their Association with National-Level Racial/Ethnic Attitudes," *Journal of Social Issues* 71, no. 1 (March 2015): 12–21.

*Hollywood had a more difficult time targeting Latino audiences*: Henry Puente, "US Latino Films (1990–1995): A Three-Tiered Marketplace," *Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingüe* 31, no. 1 (2012): 51–70.

*major corporations increased their efforts to target this demographic group, as well as other ethnic minorities*: Information on the corporate response to the Latino demographics in the 1990s and early 2000s can be found in William M. O'Barr, "Multiculturalism in the Marketplace: Targeting Latinas, African-American Women, and Gay Consumers," *Advertising & Society Review* 7, no. 4 (2006); Eric J. Bailey, *The New Face of America: How the Emerging Multiracial, Multiethnic Majority Is Changing the United States* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2013); and Silvia Betti, "The Image of Hispanics in Advertising in the United States," *Informes del Observatorio/Observatorio's Reports*, 2015, [http://cervantesobservatorio.fas.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/009\\_reports\\_hispanic\\_advertising\\_0.pdf](http://cervantesobservatorio.fas.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/009_reports_hispanic_advertising_0.pdf).

*white audiences were ravenously consuming hip-hop music, fashion, and culture*: The 70 percent statistic is from Tricia Rose, *The Hip Hop Wars: What We Talk About When We Talk About Hip Hop—and Why It Matters* (New York: Basic Civitas Books, 2008). However, other sources estimate that the percentage is closer to 60 percent or ranges from 70 to 80 percent. See Christina Montford, "When It Comes to Rap Music, Are White Boys Really Doing All the Buying?," *Atlanta Black Star*, November 6, 2014, <https://atlantablackstar.com/2014/11/06/really-listening/>, and Ciela Bialik, "Is the Conventional Wisdom Correct in Measuring Hip-Hop Audience?," *Wall Street Journal*, May 5, 2005, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB111521814339424546>.

*"When they write the history of popular culture"*: Renée Graham, "Not as Simple as Black and White," *Boston Globe*, April 2, 2002, D9.

*"This is the music of a people who have survived"*: "For Centuries, Black Music, Forged in Bondage, Has Been the Sound of Complete Artistic Freedom. No Wonder Everybody Is Always Stealing It," *New York Times*, August 14, 2009, <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/08/14/magazine/music-black-culture-appropriation.html>.

*Since the Jazz Age, the phenomenon of young white people*: I consulted the following sources when writing about the theory and history of cultural appropriation of Black culture: Toni Morrison, *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination* (New York: Vintage, 2020); Bakari Kitwana, *Why White Kids Love Hip-Hop: Wankstas, Wiggers, Wannabes, and the New Reality of Race in America* (New York: Civitas Books, 2005); Bakari Kitwana (author, journalist, and political analyst) in phone interview with the author, August 7, 2020; Tate, *Everything but the Burden*; Lauren Michele Jackson, *White Negroes: When Cornrows Were in Vogue and Other Thoughts on Cultural Appropriation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2019). All quotes from Lott's book are found in Eric Lott's *Love & Theft: Blackface Minstrelsy and the American Working Class* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 2–103.

whiteness as an identity: Here, I'm, of course, not talking about the kind of white identity espoused by white nationalists and those involved in white pride movements. For those people, there is no shame in whiteness at all. Instead, I'm talking about white people who identify as white and are, in some sense, trying to grapple with the history of that identity.

Minstrel shows have long been seen as one of the primordial moments: To add another strange twist, minstrel shows weren't primarily representations of Black culture but were white people's parodic renderings of what they saw as the music and dance of Black people. Wesley Morris's essay "For Centuries, Black Music, Forged in Bondage, Has Been the Sound of Complete Artistic Freedom. No Wonder Everybody Is Always Stealing It" gives an excellent accounting of the twists of appropriation that were part of minstrelsy.

"the Afro-Americanization of white youth": The phrase specifically comes from Cornel West, *Race Matters* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993).

As cultural critic Greg Tate put it in his 2003 book: Tate, *Everything but the Burden*.

Along with this larger adoption of hip-hop culture: All quotes from Janell Hobson come from my series of phone interviews with Janell Hobson (associate professor of women's, gender, and sexuality studies at the University at Albany), April 8, 2020, and April 13, 2020.

Her ethnic identity was often provided: Negrón-Muntaner, "Jennifer's Butt," offers a crucial account of how Lopez's butt functioned symbolically, particularly within the Latinx community, just before the release of *Out of Sight*.

But some, like journalist Teresa Wiltz: Teresa Wiltz, "Butt Seriously, What's Behind Heinie Hysteria?" *South Florida Sun-Sentinel*, October 19, 1998, <https://www.sun-sentinel.com/news/fl-xpm-1998-10-19-9810160702-story.html>.

## KIM

"I wrote that song because I was getting bigger and bigger": The original *Newsweek* article quoting Beyoncé is Allison Samuels, "What Beyoncé Wants," *Newsweek*, July 28, 2002, <https://www.newsweek.com/what-beyonce-wants-147419>.

and reached number one on the Billboard Hot 100: "The Hot 100," *Billboard*, August 11, 2001, <https://www.billboard.com/artist/destinys-child/chart-history/asi/>.

referred to in articles as "G-rated fun": "Destiny's Child: Pop Music Pied Pipers," Center for Parent/Youth Understanding, 2001, [https://web.archive.org/web/20101116200806/http://www.cpyu.org/Page\\_p.aspx?id=76738](https://web.archive.org/web/20101116200806/http://www.cpyu.org/Page_p.aspx?id=76738).

"Bootylicious" was a prime example: All quotes and imagery from "Bootylicious" can be found at Destiny's Child, "Destiny's Child - Bootylicious (Official Music Video) ft. Missy 'Misdemeanor' Elliott," music video, 4:16, October 25, 2009, <https://youtu.be/q-gtzhgweLs>.

there actually wasn't that much jelly in the video: "Destiny's Child: Pop Music Pied Pipers."

Several of the costumes referenced the attire of pimps and sex workers: Aisha Durham, "'Check On It': Beyoncé, Southern Booty, and Black Femininities in Music Video," *Feminist Media Studies* 12, no. 1 (2012): 35–49.

For the past twenty years, scholars and journalists have debated whether or not: Several of the scholars engaged in this debate include Dayna Chatman, "Pregnancy, Then It's 'Back to Business': Beyoncé, Black Femininity, and the Politics of a Post-Feminist Gender Regime," *Feminist Media Studies* 15, no.

6 (2015): 926–41, and Ann Power, “In Tune with the New Feminism,” *New York Times*, April 29, 2001.

as bell hooks suggested in 2016: bell hooks, “Beyoncé’s Lemonade is Capitalist Money-Making at Its Best,” *Guardian*, May 11, 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/music/2016/may/11/capitalism-of-beyonce-lemonade-album>.

The term bootylicious first appeared in a song in 1992: Dr. Dre and Snoop Dog, “Fuck Wit Dre Day (and Everybody’s Celebratin’),” 1992, track 2 on *The Chronic*, Death Row/Interscope, May 20, 1993, compact disc.

In 2003, when Oprah asked her to define it: Beyoncé, interview with Oprah, *The Oprah Winfrey Show*, Harpo Studios, 2004.

The following year, it was added to The Oxford English Dictionary: *The Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), s.v. *bootylicious*.

Runway models became so consistently, unnervingly thin: “Danish Fashion Ethical Charter,” Danish Ethical Fashion Charter, <http://danishfashionethicalcharter.com/#~:text=The%20Danish%20Fashion%20Ethical%20Charter,is%20a%20part%20of%20creating>, and Jerome Socolovsky, “Spain Bans Overly Skinny Models from Fashion Shows,” NPR, <https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=6103615>.

many Armenian Americans do not identify as white today: Armenians were legally declared white in the 1925 Supreme Court case *US v. Cartozian*, one in a string of cases that was trying to legally determine the whiteness of different Asian ethnic groups because, at the time, only white people could legally immigrate to the United States. The *Cartozian* decision determined Armenians were white based on dubious nineteenth-century racial science, their historical reluctance to “intermingle with the Turks,” and their connection to the Caucasian people of Russia. But because race isn’t only a legal distinction but also a cultural one, many Armenians still don’t consider themselves white, and often experience discrimination and stereotypes specific to being Armenian.

Throughout her career, Kardashian would use her mixed-race identity: For example, Kardashian referenced her Armenian ancestry in a 2011 episode of *H8R* when confronted about her background and cultural appropriation. See “Kim Kardashian,” *H8R*, CW Network, September 28, 2011, 12:55.

Vivid Entertainment released a homemade, forty-one-minute video: *Kim Kardashian, Superstar*, video created by Kim Kardashian and Ray J, Vivid Entertainment, March 21, 2007, DVD.

In Kim’s first scene of the first episode of Keeping Up with the Kardashians: “I’m Watching You,” *Keeping Up with the Kardashians*, E! Network, October 14, 2007.

a nude photo spread in *Playboy*: “Hollywood’s Next Sex Star: Kim Kardashian Takes It All Off,” *Playboy*, December 2007, <https://images-na.ssl-images-amazon.com/images/I/81JxbKAUkkL.AC.SY606.jpg>.

The show was quickly picked up for a second season: Kimberly Nordyke, “‘Kardashians’ Earns Its Keep,” *Hollywood Reporter*, November 13, 2007, <https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/tv/tv-news/kardashians-earns-keep-154906/>.

she was the most googled person in 2008: “Kim Kardashian Most Googled Celeb of 2008,” *Hindustan Times*, January 2, 2009, <https://www.hindustantimes.com/entertainment/kim-kardashian-most-googled-celeb-of-2008/story-CYvTJUGdwIv459GktIV9WP.html>.

OK! magazine reassured their readers: “Dancing With the Stars Kim Kardashian: How I Stay Thin... But Keep My Sexy Curves,” *OK! Magazine*, September 24, 2008, <https://okmagazine.com/news/cover-story-kims-fitness-plan/>.



Cosmopolitan described her as an entrepreneur: Shawna Malcolm, "Up in Kim Kardashian's Business," *Cosmopolitan*, November 2009.

she would eventually go so far as to have her butt X-rayed: "The Former Mrs. Jenner," *Keeping Up with the Kardashians*, E! Network, June 26, 2011.

In general, media stories about Kardashian seemed to suggest: "Fashion Police," *Us Weekly*, August 11, 2008.

In April 2008, Paris Hilton weighed in: Paris Hilton, interview by Chet Buchanan, *Chet Buchanan and the Morning Zoo Show*, 98.5 KLUC, April 14, 2008.

In 2009, Kardashian spoke to News of the World: Polly Graham, "Body & Soul," *News of the World*, October 4, 2009.

"excessive thinness": Jessica Bennett, "The Backlash Against Magazine Airbrushing," *Newsweek*, May 1, 2008, <https://www.newsweek.com/backlash-against-magazine-airbrushing-89805>.

In 2006, model and talk show host Tyra Banks: Shelley Fralic, "A Model of Success Takes on 'Pin-Thin' Culture," *Vancouver Sun*, February 3, 2007.

She appeared on the cover of People magazine: *People* staff, "COVER STORY: Tyra Banks Speaks Out About Her Weight," *People*, January 24, 2007, <https://people.com/health/cover-story-tyra-banks-speaks-out-about-her-weight/>.

In one 2009 Cosmopolitan profile of Kim: Malcolm, "Up in Kim Kardashian's Business."

In the two-minute trailer for her 2009 workout video: "Kim Kardashian 'Fit in Your Jeans by Friday' 3 DVD Workout Series," posted by Kim Kardashian, *Fit in Your Jeans by Friday*, YouTube, March 27, 2014 (originally released 2009), 2:55, [https://youtu.be/0hP\\_4RUQNic](https://youtu.be/0hP_4RUQNic).

as of 2021, she is the sixth-most-followed person: "Instagram Accounts with the Most Followers Worldwide as of July 2021," Statista, accessed September 17, 2021, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/421169/most-followers-instagram/>; "Top Instagram Users: Most Followers," Social Tracker, <https://www.socialtracker.io/toplists/top-50-instagram-users-by-followers/>.

Instagram's community guidelines banned nudity: Andrew Griffin, "Instagram Updates Posting Guidelines: Butts Are Out, Breastfeeding Is In," *Independent*, April 17, 2015, <https://www.independent.co.uk/life-style/gadgets-and-tech/news/instagram-updates-posting-guidelines-butts-are-out-breastfeeding-is-in-10183882.html>.

reaching a new peak in November 2014: "Break the Internet: Kim Kardashian," *Paper*, Winter 2014.

Paper got what it was asking for: David Herskovits, "How Kim Kardashian Broke the Internet with Her Butt," *Guardian*, December 17, 2014, <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2014/dec/17/kim-kardashian-butt-break-the-internet-paper-magazine>.

It was hardly the only time that Kim made aesthetic choices: Cady Lang, "Keeping Up with the Kardashians Is Ending, but Their Exploitation of Black Women's Aesthetics Continues," *Time*, June 10, 2021, <https://time.com/6072750/kardashians-blackfishing-appropriation/>.

provided what critic Allison P. Davis called: Allison P. Davis, "The End of Kim Kardashian and Kanye West's Wild Ride," *Vulture*, April 26, 2021, <https://www.vulture.com/article/kim-kardashian-kanye-west-divorce.html>.

## TWERK

In How to Bounce Like the Queen of New Orleans: Big Freedia, *How to Bounce Like the Queen of New Orleans!* | *Big Freedia's Bounce Etiquette*, video, June 6, 2018, 4:08, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?>

[v=wi-eGzxTljA](#).

[\*has been twerking and performing\*](#): More on Big Freedia's twerkshops and TV show (*Big Freedia: Queen of Bounce*) can be found in Christin Marie Taylor, "Release Your Wiggle': Big Freedia's Queer Bounce," *Southern Cultures* 24, no. 2 (2018): 60–77. According to Taylor, *Big Freedia: Queen of Bounce* was picked up in 2013 by Fuse TV.

[\*dispensing information about the history of bounce\*](#): One such interview occurred with the *Snipe* and can be found in Zoe Christmas, "Interview—Big Freedia," *Snipe*, October 7, 2013, <https://www.thesnipenews.com/music/interviews/big-freedia/>.

[\*Even before the arrival of Europeans\*](#): Neal Conan, "Joy Harjo's 'Crazy Brave' Path to Finding Her Voice," WBFO, July 9, 2012, <https://news.wbfo.org/post/joy-harjos-crazy-brave-path-finding-her-voice>.

[\*laws called the Code Noir\*](#): The complete Code Noir is available online: "(1724) Louisiana's Code Noir," BlackPast, 2007, <https://www.blackpast.org/african-american-history/louisianas-code-noir-1724/>.

[\*Wynton Marsalis once declared that\*](#): Nick Douglas, "Black History: Congo Square, New Orleans—The Heart of American Music," *Afropunk*, February 26, 2018, <https://afropunk.com/2018/02/black-history-congo-square-new-orleans-heart-american-music/>.

[\*The dance was part of a spiritual practice\*](#): In the centuries since the heyday of Congo Square, however, the mapouka and its descendants were increasingly interpreted as primarily sexual dances, and their spiritual aspects were overshadowed by angst around exhibitions of sexuality. At the end of the twentieth century, the dance was briefly banned in Côte d'Ivoire because it was considered lewd in the devoutly religious country. It is still restricted in Togo, Nigeria, Burkina Faso, and Cameroon.

[\*They also danced the bamboula\*](#): Information on Congo Square dances was found in Makau Kitata, "Sexualising the Performance, Objectifying the Performer: The Twerk Dance in Kenya," *Agenda* 34, no. 3 (2020): 11–21; Maureen Monahan, "What Is the Origin of Twerking?," Mental Floss, August 28, 2013, <https://www.mentalfloss.com/article/51365/what-origin-twerking>; Gary A. Donaldson, "A Window on Slave Culture: Dances at Congo Square in New Orleans, 1800–1862," *Journal of Negro History* 69, no. 2 (1984): 63–72; and Taylor, "Release Your Wiggle."

[\*Congo Square represented not only the continuation\*](#): Douglas, "Black History: Congo Square."

[\*happened not only in Congo Square\*](#): Elizabeth Pérez, "The Ontology of Twerk: From 'Sexy' Black Movement Style to Afro-Diasporic Sacred Dance," *African and Black Diaspora: An International Journal* 9, no. 1 (2016): 16–31.

[\*In 1817, the city government of New Orleans\*](#): Donaldson, "A Window on Slave Culture," 63–66.

[\*According to Kim Marie Vaz\*](#): Kim Marie Vaz, *The "Baby Dolls": Breaking the Race and Gender Barriers of the New Orleans Mardi Gras Tradition* (Baton Rouge, LA: LSU Press, 2013).

[\*and was one possible inspiration for Josephine Baker's\*](#): Taylor, "Release Your Wiggle," 65.

[\*Merline Kimble, a granddaughter of a Baby Doll\*](#): The interview with Merline Kimble can be found in "Interview: Merline Kimble of the Gold Digger Baby Dolls," interview with Action Jackson, WWOZ, August 12, 2018, <https://www.wwoz.org/blog/418476>.

[\*a rebellion against "what was put on women"\*](#): It is this resistance that encouraged Kimble to start her new iteration, and one of the reasons why she encourages children to participate in Baby Doll performances. Although there is an element of sexuality, to interpret the Baby Dolls as only sexy is to misunderstand the role that booty dancing and second lines play in New Orleans culture. The Baby Dolls dress up, dance, and flaunt their butts as a way to celebrate and connect to the women of New Orleans's past.

[\*Another thread in the evolution of twerk comes from Jamaica\*](#): All research on dancehall was found using the following sources: Thomas Vendryes, "Versions, Dubs and Riddims: Dub and the Transient Dynamics of Jamaican Music," *Dancecult: Journal of Electronic Dance Music Culture* 7, no. 2 (2015); Taliesin

Gilkes-Bower, “Welcome to Kingston, the World’s Dancehall Mecca,” *Outline*, June 28, 2018, <https://theoutline.com/post/5125/jamaica-kingston-dancehall-photo-essay?zd=1&zi=jnnp5xln>;

Sharine Taylor, “The Essential Guide to Dancehall,” *Red Bull Music Academy*, July 10, 2019, <https://daily.redbullmusicacademy.com/2019/07/essential-guide-to-dancehall>.

*where local musicians and dancers, deeply influenced*: Rebecca Trejo, “A Brief History of New Orleans’ Bounce Music Style,” *Culture Trip*, July 22, 2021, <https://theculturetrip.com/north-america/usa/louisiana/new-orleans/articles/history-of-bounce-music/>.

*Although undoubtedly used colloquially*: Pérez, “The Ontology of Twerk,” 18. The original music video for “Do the Jubilee All” can also be found on YouTube: DJ Jubilee, “Do the Jubilee All,” video, 4:21, February 29, 2012, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oSCz5RP2gfY>.

*After “Jubilee,” twerk began cropping*: Taylor, “Release Your Wiggle,” 66.

*Still, it remained mostly a New Orleans phenomenon*: Information on the New Orleans bounce scene was found in Kyra D. Gaunt, “YouTube, Twerking, and You,” 256, and Christina Schoux Casey and Maeve Eberhardt, “‘She Don’t Need No Help’: Deconsolidating Gender, Sex and Sexuality in New Orleans Bounce Music,” *Gender & Language* 12, no. 3 (2018).

*The queer community, in particular*: Gaunt, “YouTube, Twerking, and You,” 256; Casey and Eberhardt, “‘She Don’t Need No Help,’” 318–45; Brett Berk, “New Orleans Sissy Bounce: Rap Goes Drag,” *Vanity Fair*, March 11, 2010, <https://www.vanityfair.com/culture/2010/03/katey-red-starts-a-band>.

*“A lot of people think bounce is simply”*: Jason Newman, “Big Freedia Reflects on Miley Cyrus, Coming Out in New Memoir,” *Rolling Stone*, July 1, 2015, <https://www.rollingstone.com/music/music-news/big-freedia-reflects-on-miley-cyrus-coming-out-in-new-memoir-179654/>.

*The mass diaspora that resulted*: Gaunt, “YouTube, Twerking, and You,” 248.

*A group of dancers from Atlanta called Twerk Team*: Information about Twerk Team came from my conversation with Kyra Gaunt.

## MILEY

*Hannah Montana premiered on the Disney Channel*: *Hannah Montana*, Disney Channel, four seasons, 2006–2011.

*In the publicity, music videos, lyrics*: Tracy Clayton, “Miley Cyrus Wants Something That Feels ‘Black,’” *The Root*, June 13, 2013, <https://www.theroot.com/miley-cyrus-wants-something-that-feels-black-1790884859>.

*in one of the most controversial live performances of the 2010s*: Even months and years later, news sources continued to report on and analyze the 2013 VMAs. See Katy Kroll, “Twerk It Out: Miley and Robin’s VMA Performance, One Year Later,” *Rolling Stone*, August 22, 2014, <https://www.rollingstone.com/culture/culture-news/twerk-it-out-miley-and-robins-vma-performance-one-year-later-65286/>.

*It started with a giant space teddy bear*: All descriptions of the 2013 VMAs come from online recordings of Miley Cyrus’s performance, e.g., “Miley Cyrus VMA 2013 with Robin Thicke SHOCKED,” YouTube video posted by Juan Manuel Cruz, 6:52, August 27, 2013, <https://youtu.be/LfcvmABhmxs>.

*Marvin Gaye’s “Got to Give It Up”*: Gaye’s family won the lawsuit, and Thicke and Pharrell had to pay them \$5.3 million.

Cyrus would later say: All quotes and descriptions from Miley Cyrus's 2013 documentary can be found in *Miley: The Movement*, directed by Paul Bozymowski, RadicalMedia, 2013.

the media was ablaze with aghast commentary: After the VMAs, a host of criticism against Cyrus came out, including: Kelly Clarkson (@kellyclarkson), "2 words... #pitchystrippers," Twitter, August 26, 2014; Patrick Kevin Day, "Miley Cyrus's VMA Performance: Media React in Shock," *Los Angeles Times*, August 26, 2013, <https://www.latimes.com/entertainment/tv/showtracker/la-et-st-miley-cyrus-vma-performance-media-reacts-in-shock-20130826-story.html>; "Sherri Shepherd: Miley Cyrus 'Going to Hell in a Twerking Handbasket' (VIDEO)," *Huffington Post*, August 27, 2013, [https://www.huffpost.com/entry/sherri-shepherd-miley-cyrus-going-to-hell-video\\_n\\_3820742](https://www.huffpost.com/entry/sherri-shepherd-miley-cyrus-going-to-hell-video_n_3820742); Jane Timm, "Brzezinski: Miley Cyrus VMA Performance 'Really, Really Disturbing,'" MSNBC, August 26, 2013, <https://www.msnbc.com/morning-joe/brzezinski-miley-cyrus-vma-performance-msna154221>; Alexander Abad-Santos, "Creator of the Foam Finger Is Deeply Upset with Miley Cyrus," *Atlantic*, August 29, 2013, <https://www.theatlantic.com/culture/archive/2013/08/creator-foam-finger-deeply-upset-miley-cyrus/311615/>; Jessica Derschowitz, "Miley Cyrus' VMA performance Blasted by Parents Television Council," CBS News, August 27, 2013, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/miley-cyrus-vma-performance-blasted-by-parents-television-council/>.  
Brooke Shields, who had played Hannah Montana's: Randee Dawn, "Brooke Shields on 'Hannah Montana' Co-star Miley Cyrus: 'It's a Bit Desperate,'" *Today*, August 26, 2013, <https://www.today.com/popculture/brooke-shields-hannah-montana-co-star-miley-cyrus-its-bit-8C10995696>.

In the documentary, she offers: *Miley: The Movement*.

"It's mind-boggling to me that there was even a controversy": John Norris, "Miley Cyrus Breaks Silence on Rootsy New Music, Fiance Liam Hemsworth & America: 'Unity Is What We Need,'" *Billboard*, May 5, 2017, <https://www.billboard.com/articles/news/magazine-feature/7783997/miley-cyrus-cover-story-new-music-malibu>.

the most mainstream and white of cultural outlets: Kristin T. Studeman, "Starting from the Bottom: Experts Weigh in on the Cultural Obsession with the Butt," *Vogue*, August 27, 2014, <https://www.vogue.com/article/butts-vma-doctors-weigh-in>; Marisa Meltzer, "For Posterior's Sake," *New York Times*, September 17, 2014, <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/09/18/fashion/more-women-seeking-curveaceous-posteriors.html>.

As writers like Allison P. Davis pointed out: Allison P. Davis, "Vogue Has Just Discovered Big Butts," *The Cut*, September 10, 2014, <https://www.thecut.com/2014/09/vogue-has-just-discovered-big-butts.html>.

## THE YEAR OF THE BUTT

That year 8,654 butt augmentation procedures were performed: "2013 Cosmetic Plastic Surgery Statistics," American Society of Plastic Surgeons, 2013, <https://www.plasticsurgery.org/documents/News/Statistics/2013/cosmetic-procedure-trends-2013.pdf>. See "Buttock augmentation with fat grafting" for the 2012 statistics.

The Brazilian butt lift: A version of the BBL was developed in the 1960s by Ivo Pitanguy, a surgeon who founded the world's first plastic surgery training center in Brazil and is often called the "pioneer" of the Brazilian Butt Lift. However, this early version of the BBL was different from what the surgery is today. When he first tried it, it was more of a butt lift than an augmentation because it removed excess skin to



correct sagging. In the procedure known as a Brazilian Butt Lift today, a doctor injects fat back into the butt that was taken from another part of the body.

*by 2014 the number reached 11,505*: “2014 Cosmetic Plastic Surgery Statistics,” American Society of Plastic Surgeons, 2014, <https://www.plasticsurgery.org/documents/News/Statistics/2014/plastic-surgery-statistics-full-report-2014.pdf>. For the 2014 statistics, see “Buttock augmentation with fat grafting,” p. 7.

*Although a BBL creates a more “natural” look*: “Plastic Surgery Societies Issue Urgent Warning About the Risks Associated with Brazilian Butt Lifts,” American Society of Plastic Surgeons, August 6, 2018, <https://www.plasticsurgery.org/news/press-releases/plastic-surgery-societies-issue-urgent-warning-about-the-risks-associated-with-brazilian-butt-lifts>.

*but still the number of BBLs performed has continued*: See “Buttock augmentation with fat grafting” on pages 2 and 7 of the 2019 and 2018 reports, respectively. In 2019, 28,076 buttock augmentations were reported, compared to 24,099 in 2018. “2019 National Plastic Surgery Statistics,” American Society of Plastic Surgeons, 2019, <https://www.plasticsurgery.org/documents/News/Statistics/2019/plastic-surgery-statistics-report-2019.pdf>; “2018 Plastic Surgery Statistics Report,” American Society of Plastic Surgeons, 2018, <https://www.plasticsurgery.org/documents/News/Statistics/2018/plastic-surgery-statistics-full-report-2018.pdf>.

*In 2013, a Long Islander named Jen Selter*: Ally Jones, “Instagram’s Butt-lebrity: The Bar for Fame Hits Rock Bottom,” *Atlantic*, January 3, 2014, <https://www.theatlantic.com/culture/archive/2014/01/instagrams-butt-lebrity-bar-fame-hits-rock-bottom/356677/>.

*the promotional image from the first season of KUWTK*: *Keeping Up with the Kardashians*, advertisement, E! Network, 2007.

*“Anyone who works hard could be where I am”*: Claire Howorth, “The Posterior Economics of Motivation Mogul Jen Selter,” *Elle*, December 13, 2013, <https://www.elle.com/beauty/health-fitness/news/a14992/jen-selter-interview/>. The five-thousand-followers statistic can also be found in Hilary Sheinbaum, “On Instagram, ‘Fitness Inspiration’ Is Often an Eyeful,” *USA Today*, January 4, 2014, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2014/01/04/fitness-inspiration-instagram/4295599/>.

*Jennifer Lopez released the anthem “Booty”*: Jennifer Lopez, Iggy Azalea, “Booty,” 2014, track 10 on *A.K.A.*, Nuyorican/Capitol, August 24, 2014.

*Beyoncé, the woman who had introduced*: Beyoncé, *Beyoncé*, Parkwood/Columbia, December 13, 2013.

*white singer-songwriter Meghan Trainor offered up*: Meghan Trainor, “All About That Bass,” video, June 11, 2014, 3:10, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7PCkvCPvDXk>.

*Nicki Minaj released “Anaconda”*: Nicki Minaj, “Anaconda,” video, August 19, 2014, 4:49, <https://youtu.be/LDZX4ooRsWs>.

*Katey Red started recording an album in 1998*: More information on Katey Red’s music career and first-ever music video can be found in Gaunt, “YouTube, Twerking, and You,” 257.

*“If a white girl does something that seems to be Black”*: *The Ellen DeGeneres Show*, “Julie Bowen, Nicki Minaj,” season 11, episode 15, directed by Liz Patrick, aired September 27, 2013, on NBC.

## RECLAMATION

*Kelechi Okafor, one of the most popular twerk instructors:* All quotes from Kelechi Okafor are from my phone interview with Okafor (actress, director, public speaker, and twerk instructor), November 27, 2020.

# *Index*

**A note about the index:** The pages referenced in this index refer to the page numbers in the print edition. Clicking on a page number will take you to the ebook location that corresponds to the beginning of that page in the print edition. For a comprehensive list of locations of any word or phrase, use your reading system's search function.

- About, Nicolas, [76](#)
- aerobics, [150–54](#), [160–61](#), [165–70](#)
- Aerobics* (Cooper), [150](#)
- Affleck, Ben, [193](#)
- Africa and Africans, [12](#), [51](#), [52](#), [54](#), [61](#), [65](#), [71](#), [106](#)
  - Khoe, [51](#), [52](#), [56](#), [57](#), [67](#), [68–69](#), [75](#), [76](#), [90](#), [91](#), [264–65n](#)
  - sexuality of, [54](#), [58](#), [61](#), [65–66](#), [90](#)
  - South Africa, [51](#), [52](#), [55](#), [62](#), [75–77](#)
- African Institution, [59](#)
- Alexander, Elizabeth, [75](#), [91–92](#)
- American Museum of Natural History, [115](#), [117](#), [119](#), [120](#)
- Anchorage Daily News*, [155](#)
- androgyny, [173–75](#)
- anus, [11](#), [180](#)
- Armenians, [207–8](#), [290n](#)
- L'Art Vivant*, [108](#)
- Asian women, [105](#)
- As Nasty as They Wanna Be*, [187](#)
- Atlantic*, [39](#), [74](#)
- Baartman, Sarah, [10](#), [51–67](#), [68](#), [71](#), [72](#), [74–77](#), [82](#), [89–93](#), [109](#), [123](#), [182](#), [200](#), [213](#), [243](#), [249](#), [264n](#), [265n](#)
  - bustles and, [89–93](#)
  - death of, [13](#), [63](#), [93](#)
  - remains of, [63–64](#), [75–76](#), [91](#), [182](#), [258n](#)
- Baby Dolls, [223](#), [294n](#)
- “Baby Got Back,” [177–86](#), [188](#), [192](#), [193](#), [204](#), [214](#), [237](#)
- Baker, Jean-Claude, [107–8](#)
- Baker, Josephine, [106–10](#), [223](#)
- Banks, Tyra, [210](#)

Barrett, Ron, [24](#)  
Barrymore, Drew, [206](#)  
Bartlett, Alex, [136–39](#), [141](#), [142](#), [251](#)  
Bartlett, Jamie, [29](#)  
beauty, [1](#), [6](#), [8](#), [9](#), [11](#), [39](#), [43–44](#), [176](#), [200](#), [245](#), [249](#)  
    in animals, [36](#), [43–44](#)  
    Ellis on, [72–73](#)  
    fitness culture and, [160](#)  
Beauvoir, Simone de, [141](#)  
Bechdel Test, [182](#)  
belfies, [235–36](#)  
Belskie, Abram, [115](#), [117](#), [141](#)  
Bernstein, Adam, [180](#)  
“better baby” competitions, [116–17](#)  
Beyoncé, [202–6](#), [212](#), [236–37](#)  
Big Freedia, [219–20](#), [225](#), [237–38](#)  
“Big Ole Butt,” [188](#)  
*Billboard*, [184](#), [186](#), [187](#), [203](#), [227](#), [233](#), [234](#)  
bipedalism, [21](#), [22](#), [27](#)  
birds, [42–43](#)  
    peacocks, [35](#), [36](#), [41](#), [43](#), [44](#)  
*Birthing Series*, [115](#), [120](#)  
Black Eyed Peas, [194](#)  
Black people  
    American, in Paris, [106](#)  
    appropriation of culture of, [197–200](#), [214–15](#), [233](#), [238](#), [242](#), [245](#), [246](#)  
    demographic shift and, [194–96](#)  
    exoticization of, [106](#)  
    lawyers, [163](#)  
    television characters, [195](#)  
Black women, [12–14](#), [65](#), [93](#), [182–83](#), [186](#), [214](#)  
    butts of, [71–73](#), [91](#), [108](#), [177](#), [181](#), [182](#), [189](#), [200](#), [204](#), [213–14](#), [230](#), [232](#), [237](#), [249](#)  
    sexuality of, [66](#), [71](#), [90](#), [91](#), [110](#), [183](#), [204](#), [232](#), [243](#), [249](#)  
Bliven, Bruce, [101](#)  
“Blurred Lines,” [230](#)  
Bolt, Usain, [21](#)  
bodybuilders, [150](#)  
“Bootylicious,” [202–5](#)  
brain, [22](#), [28](#), [32](#), [43](#), [73](#)  
Bramble, Dennis, [22](#), [29](#), [258n](#)  
Brazilian butt lift (BBL), [234–35](#), [297n](#)  
breastfeeding, [33–34](#)  
Brinkley, Christie, [156](#), [174](#)  
Brzezinski, Mika, [231](#)  
*Buck v. Bell*, [74](#), [268n](#)

*Buns of Steel*, [145](#), [148](#), [150](#), [155–58](#), [160](#), [169](#), [235](#)

Bureau of Home Economics, [117–18](#)

Burgard, Deb, [164–70](#), [251](#)

bustles, [81–93](#), [94](#), [98](#), [100](#), [102](#), [110](#), [251](#)

Butler, Judith, [141](#)

Caesars, Peter, [52–53](#), [55](#), [57](#), [58](#), [59](#), [60](#), [62](#)

Campaign for Economic Democracy, [153](#)

Campbell, Heyworth, [96](#)

Canty-Letsome, Rosezella, [162–64](#), [167–69](#), [250–51](#)

“Carpool Karaoke,” [193](#)

Chanel, Coco, [97](#), [100–101](#), [103](#), [105](#), [109](#), [127](#), [160](#)

Charnas, Dan, [180](#)

“Cherry Pie,” [181](#), [183](#)

Chicago World’s Fair, [117](#)

Chinese women, [105](#)

Christianity, [58](#), [65](#), [66](#), [71](#), [76](#), [221](#)

Ciara, [240](#)

cities, [99–101](#)

Clarkson, Kelly, [231](#)

Cleveland Museum of Health, [120–21](#)

Cleveland *Plain Dealer*, [121](#), [122](#)

Clinton, Bill, [175](#)

Clooney, George, [191](#)

clothing and fashion, [87–88](#), [91–93](#)

body types and, [114](#)

bustles, [81–93](#), [94](#), [98](#), [100](#), [102](#), [110](#), [251](#)

Chanel and, [97](#), [100–101](#), [103](#), [105](#), [109](#), [127](#), [160](#)

Conway and, [94–97](#), [102](#), [103](#), [106](#), [107](#), [115](#), [249](#)

corsets, [81](#), [86](#), [89](#), [94](#), [100](#), [103](#), [160](#), [202](#)

“Eastern” influences in, [104–5](#)

flappers and, [97–99](#), [101–7](#), [110](#), [116](#), [175](#), [249](#)

history and, [88](#)

magazines and, [71](#), [95–97](#), [103](#), [124](#), [154](#), [173](#), [175](#), [185](#), [193–94](#), [205–6](#), [235](#)

petticoats and crinolines, [84–87](#)

Poiret and, [97](#), [99–100](#), [104](#), [105](#), [160](#)

ready-to-wear, [101](#), [118](#), [123](#), [125–33](#)

sewing and dressmaking, [87](#), [92](#), [125–27](#), [133](#)

shopping and dressing rooms, [113–14](#), [124](#), [247–51](#)

standardized sizes in, [118](#), [123](#), [125–33](#)

thinness and, [97–98](#), [100](#), [102–4](#)

undergarments, [88](#), [89](#), [100](#), [139–42](#)

*Colbert Report, The*, [23](#)

colonialism, [65](#), [67](#), [93](#), [258n](#)

Congo Square, [220–22](#)

Connelly, Chris, [196](#)  
Conway, Gordon, [94–97](#), [102](#), [103](#), [106](#), [107](#), [115](#), [249](#)  
Conway, Tommie, [94](#), [95](#)  
Corden, James, [193](#)  
corsets, [81](#), [86](#), [89](#), [94](#), [100](#), [103](#), [160](#), [202](#)  
*Cosmopolitan*, [39](#), [193](#), [209](#), [211](#)  
Coury, Nick, [25–27](#), [30](#), [260n](#)  
crinolines, [84–87](#)  
Crudup, Arthur “Big Boy,” [199](#)  
Cuccia, Vinnie, [136–39](#), [141](#), [142](#), [251](#)  
Cuvier, Georges, [49–51](#), [62–64](#), [68](#), [75](#), [76](#), [116](#), [249](#)  
Cyrus, Billy Ray, [227](#), [228](#)  
Cyrus, Miley, [227–33](#), [234](#), [237](#), [238](#), [242](#), [243](#), [245](#)

dancing, [221–24](#), [244](#), [293n](#)  
    Baker and, [107–10](#)  
    for exercise, [150–51](#), [153](#), [166–67](#)  
    twerking, [219–20](#), [224–26](#), [230–33](#), [237](#), [239–45](#)  
*Dancing Revolution* (Smith), [183](#)  
*Dancing with the Stars*, [209](#)  
Darwin, Charles, [27](#), [36](#), [37](#), [43](#), [49](#), [72](#)  
Davis, Allison P., [214](#), [233](#)  
de Blasio, Abele, [72](#)  
DeGeneres, Ellen, [155](#)  
demographics, [194–96](#), [286n](#)  
Destiny’s Child, [202–5](#), [225](#)  
Deutsches Hygiene-Museum, [120](#)  
*Diadem*, HMS, [55](#)  
Dickinson, Robert Latou, [115](#), [117](#), [141](#)  
diets, [103–4](#), [109](#), [160](#), [164](#), [202](#), [235](#), [251](#)  
Dixon Gottschild, Brenda, [108](#), [109](#)  
DJ Jubilee, [224](#)  
Dorsey-Rivas, Amylia, [178](#), [179](#)  
drag queens, [134–39](#)  
Dunlop, Alexander, [53–55](#), [57–60](#), [62](#)  
Durham, Aisha, [204](#)

Ehrman, Edwina, [88](#)  
Ellis, Havelock, [72–73](#)  
Ellison, Jenny, [168](#), [169](#)  
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, [70](#)  
*Essence*, [154](#)  
eugenics, [69](#), [73–74](#), [116](#), [117](#), [119–21](#), [123](#), [268n](#), [276n](#)  
*Everything but the Burden* (Tate), [199–200](#)  
evolution, [21–23](#), [28](#), [29](#), [31](#), [32](#), [35](#), [36](#), [37](#), [40](#), [45](#), [49](#)

adaptationism and, [41](#), [43](#), [45](#)  
beauty and, [36](#), [43–44](#)  
natural selection in, [36–37](#), [43](#)  
sexual attraction and, [38–41](#), [44–45](#)  
whiteness and, [69–70](#)  
evolutionary psychology, [38–41](#), [43](#), [44](#), [72](#)  
exercise and fitness, [99](#), [103](#), [109](#), [145–61](#), [162–70](#), [235](#), [236](#), [251](#)  
    aerobic, [150–54](#), [160–61](#), [165–70](#)  
    beauty standards and, [160](#)  
    *Buns of Steel*, [145](#), [148](#), [150](#), [155–58](#), [160](#), [169](#), [235](#)  
    Burgard and, [164–70](#), [251](#)  
    Canty-Letsome and, [162–64](#), [167–69](#), [251](#)  
    fat fitness movement, [165–70](#)  
    femininity and, [151](#), [152](#), [160](#), [161](#)  
    feminism and, [151–52](#), [168](#)  
    Fonda and, [152–54](#), [156](#), [158–61](#), [164](#)  
    Kardashians and, [211](#)  
    Smithey and, [145–48](#), [154–56](#), [249](#)  
    sports, [151–52](#)  
    Webb and, [156–58](#), [161](#)  
  
Farina, Dennis, [200](#)  
farting, [54](#)  
fashion, *see* [clothing and fashion](#)  
Fashion Institute of Technology, [103](#)  
fat, [4](#), [31–35](#), [148](#), [205–6](#), [235](#)  
    plastic surgery and, [103](#), [109](#), [206](#)  
    use of word, [166](#)  
femininity, [2](#), [11](#), [13](#), [14](#), [34](#), [73](#), [93](#), [96](#), [97](#), [140–42](#), [190](#)  
    drag queens and, [135](#), [138](#), [139](#)  
    exercise and, [151](#), [152](#), [160](#), [161](#)  
    Norma statue and, [119](#), [141](#)  
    undergarments and, [139–42](#)  
    whiteness and, [242–43](#), [246](#)  
feminism, [203–5](#)  
    fitness and, [151–52](#), [168](#)  
    MTV and, [180–81](#), [184](#)  
Fisher, Ronald, [43](#)  
fitness, *see* [exercise and fitness](#)  
flappers, [97–99](#), [101–7](#), [110](#), [116](#), [175](#), [249](#)  
Fonda, Jane, [152–54](#), [156](#), [158–61](#), [164](#)  
fossils, [20–22](#), [29–30](#), [40](#), [258n](#)  
France, [61](#), [106](#)  
    Baker in, [106](#), [108](#), [109](#)  
    National Museum of Natural History in, [49–50](#), [62–64](#), [75](#), [91](#)

Universal Exhibitions in, [75](#), [91](#), [104](#)  
freak shows, [53](#), [56](#)  
Freedia, [219–20](#), [225](#), [237–38](#)

Galluzzi, Patti, [180–81](#), [183–84](#)  
Galton, Francis, [69](#), [73](#), [116](#)  
Gates, Henry Louis, Jr., [188](#)  
Gaunt, Kyra D., [182–83](#), [185](#), [186](#)  
Gautier, Théophile, [175](#)  
Gebhard, Bruno, [120–23](#)  
gender, [135](#), [140](#), [141](#)  
*Gender Trouble* (Butler), [141](#)  
Gibson, Charles, [94–95](#)  
Gibson girl, [94–96](#), [116](#), [119](#)  
Gilman, Sander, [4](#), [66–67](#), [71](#), [75](#)  
Glaum-Lathbury, Abigail, [128](#), [131–33](#)  
gluteus maximus, [23](#), [28](#), [29](#), [31](#)  
*Godey's Lady's Book*, [71](#)  
Golden Door, [156–57](#)  
Google, [192](#)  
Gore, Tipper, [181](#), [187](#)  
Gottschild, Brenda Dixon, [108](#), [109](#)  
Goude, Jean-Paul, [213](#)  
Gould, Stephen Gay, [40](#), [41](#), [43](#), [45](#)  
Gray, Asa, [36](#)  
*Great Shape* (Lyons and Burgard), [166](#), [168](#)  
Greeks, ancient, [54](#), [89](#), [90](#), [119](#)  
Griqua people, [75](#)  
grunge, [174](#)

Hale, Sarah, [71](#)  
*Hannah Montana*, [227–28](#), [231](#), [232](#)  
Harlem, [106](#), [107](#)  
*Harper's Bazaar*, [96](#)  
Haufe, Chris, [37](#), [40](#), [41](#), [44–45](#)  
Hayden, Tom, [152](#)  
Held, John, Jr., [97](#)  
heroin chic, [174](#), [175](#)  
Hill, Anita, [183](#)  
Hilton, Paris, [206–10](#)  
hip-hop, [3](#), [183](#), [187–89](#), [196–97](#), [199–201](#), [224](#), [229](#), [237](#)  
Hispanic and Latinx people, [190–91](#), [194–96](#), [200](#)  
*History of the Anglo-Saxons, The* (Turner), [70](#)  
Hobson, Janell, [65–66](#), [68](#), [200](#)  
Hoke, Morgan, [32–34](#)



Hollander, Anne, [102–3](#)  
hominids, [19–20](#), [31](#), [32](#)  
*Homo erectus*, [19](#), [22–23](#), [26–29](#), [32](#)  
*Homo sapiens*, [31](#), [50](#)  
horses, [28](#)  
    Man Against Horse Race, [24–27](#), [30](#), [260n](#)  
“Hottentots,” [51](#), [54](#), [69](#), [72](#)  
“Hottentot Venus,” [67](#), [89–91](#)  
    *The Hottentot Venus; or, The Hatred of Frenchwomen*, [89–90](#), [243](#)  
    Sarah Baartman, *see* [Baartman, Sarah](#)  
Houston, Whitney, [184](#), [186](#)  
*Houston Chronicle*, [169](#)  
Hudson’s, [113–14](#), [247](#)  
Hull-House Museum, [10](#)  
human remains, displays of, [67](#), [76](#), [258n](#)  
    of Baartman, [63–64](#), [75–76](#), [91](#), [182](#)  
Hurricane Katrina, [225](#)  
  
Icon, [134–36](#)  
immigration, [70](#), [71](#), [99](#), [105](#), [126](#), [224](#)  
Industrial Revolution, [87](#), [125](#)  
*In Living Color*, [190](#)  
Instagram, [124](#), [135](#), [211–12](#), [234](#), [236](#)  
*Irish Penny Journal*, [89](#)  
Irish people, [70](#), [71](#), [126](#)  
“I Will Always Love You,” [184](#), [186](#)  
  
Jackson, Michael, [188](#), [207](#)  
Jamaica, [223–24](#)  
Jane Addams Hull-House Museum, [10](#)  
Japan  
    aesthetics of, [104–5](#)  
    atomic bombing of, [121](#)  
Jazzercise, [150–51](#)  
Jenner, Caitlyn, [208](#)  
Jenner, Kris, [207–9](#)  
jokes, [185–86](#)  
Jones, Grace, [213](#)  
Jones, Lisa, [91](#)  
Jones, Lydia, [108](#)  
  
Kardashian, Kim, [207–15](#), [234–36](#)  
Kardashian, Robert, [207](#), [208](#)  
Karl, Stuart, [153–54](#)  
Keats, John, [175](#)  
*Keeping Up with the Kardashians*, [208–9](#), [211](#), [212](#), [236](#)

Khoe people, [51](#), [52](#), [56](#), [57](#), [67](#), [68–69](#), [75](#), [76](#), [90](#), [91](#), [264–65n](#)  
Kimble, Merline, [223](#), [294n](#)  
Klein, Calvin, [173–76](#)  
Knowles, Beyoncé, [202–6](#), [212](#), [236–37](#)

Lake Turkana, [19–20](#)  
Latinx and Hispanic people, [190–91](#), [194–96](#), [200](#)  
Lawless, Lucy, [192](#)  
Lawson, Tina, [204](#)  
lawyers, [163](#)  
Leakey, Richard, [20](#)  
Leno, Jay, [192](#), [231](#)  
Levinson, André, [108](#)  
Lewontin, Richard, [41](#), [43](#), [45](#)  
Lieberman, Daniel, [20–29](#), [40](#), [49](#), [258n](#)  
Linnaeus, Carl, [52](#)  
LL Cool J, [188](#)  
London, [53](#), [54](#), [56–61](#), [64](#)  
London International Exhibition, [104](#)  
London *Times*, [56](#), [58](#), [85](#)  
Lopez, Jennifer, [190–94](#), [200–201](#), [202](#), [204](#), [210](#), [212](#), [236](#)  
*Los Angeles Times*, [186](#), [231](#)  
Lott, Eric, [198](#)  
*Love and Theft* (Lott), [198](#)  
Lover, Ed, [189](#)  
Lyons, Pat, [166](#), [168](#)

Macaulay, Zachary, [58–59](#), [265–66n](#)  
Maier, Howard, [156](#), [157](#)  
Maier Group, [156](#), [158](#)  
mainstream, concept of, [194](#)  
Makhubu, Nomusa, [77](#)  
Man Against Horse Race, [24–27](#), [30](#), [260n](#)  
Mandela, Nelson, [75–76](#)  
Mardi Gras, [222–23](#)  
Marsalis, Wynton, [221](#)  
Marx, Gilda, [153](#)  
Mbeki, Thabo, [76](#)  
*Men's Health*, [39](#)  
“Me So Horny,” [187](#)  
Middleton, Pippa, [235](#)  
military, [117](#), [126](#)  
Minaj, Nicki, [237](#), [238](#)  
minstrel shows, [198](#)  
Missett, Judi, [150–53](#)

Mix-A-Lot, Sir, [177–86](#), [189](#), [193](#), [204](#), [214](#), [224](#)  
Monet, Claude, [104](#)  
Morris, Wesley, [196–97](#), [199](#)  
Morrison, Toni, [197](#), [198](#)  
Moss, Kate, [173–76](#), [206](#), [207](#)  
movies, [102](#), [190–92](#), [195](#)  
MTV, [180–81](#), [184](#), [186](#), [188–89](#), [196](#), [199](#), [229](#), [231](#)  
muscles, [4](#), [19](#), [23](#), [28](#), [31](#), [32](#)  
    gluteus maximus, [23](#), [28](#), [29](#), [31](#)  
Musée de l’Homme, [75](#), [76](#)  
Musée d’Orsay, [75](#)  
Museum at the Fashion Institute of Technology, [103](#)  
music, [177–89](#), [194](#), [236–37](#)  
    “Baby Got Back,” [177–86](#), [188](#), [192](#), [193](#), [204](#), [214](#), [237](#)  
    Black, [196–97](#), [199–200](#)  
    “Bootylicious,” [202–5](#)  
    hip-hop, [3](#), [183](#), [187–89](#), [196–97](#), [199–201](#), [224](#), [229](#), [237](#)  
    Jamaican, [223–24](#)  
    “My Humps,” [194](#)  
  
Napoleon, [126](#)  
National Museum of Natural History, France, [49–50](#), [62–64](#), [75](#), [91](#)  
natural selection, [36–37](#), [43](#)  
Nava, Gregory, [190–91](#)  
Nazis, [73](#), [74](#)  
Negrón-Muntaner, Frances, [191](#)  
neoliberalism, [149](#), [152](#), [279n](#)  
New Orleans, La., [219–26](#), [237](#), [244](#), [294n](#)  
*New Republic*, [101](#)  
*News of the World*, [210](#)  
*Newsweek*, [202](#)  
New York State Commission for the Blind, [137](#)  
*New York Times*, [74](#), [169](#), [188](#), [195](#), [233](#)  
New York World’s Fair, [115](#)  
Ngeneo, Bernard, [19–20](#)  
normalcy, [117](#), [121–24](#), [133](#), [135](#), [141](#), [142](#)  
    Norma, [115–17](#), [119–23](#), [129](#), [130](#), [135](#), [141](#)  
    Normman, [115–17](#), [119](#), [120](#)  
    perfection and, [119–20](#), [129](#)  
  
O’Brien, Ruth, [118](#), [122](#), [123](#), [127](#), [249](#)  
*OK!*, [209](#)  
Okafor, Kelechi, [239–44](#), [246](#), [251](#)  
*Out of Sight*, [191–92](#), [200](#)  
  
Paleolithic art, [54](#)

Palin, Sarah, [147](#)  
*Paper*, [213](#), [234](#)  
Parents Music Resource Center, [181](#), [187](#)  
Paris  
    Bartman in, [61–62](#)  
    Baker in, [106](#), [108](#), [109](#)  
    Black Americans in, [106](#)  
    National Museum of Natural History in, [49–50](#), [62–64](#), [75](#), [91](#)  
    slavery in, [61](#), [106](#)  
    Universal Exhibitions in, [75](#), [91](#), [104](#)  
Parks, Suzan-Lori, [75](#)  
Parton, Dolly, [227](#)  
Partridge, Kate, [168](#)  
Peabody Museum of Natural History, [42](#)  
peach emoji, [268n](#)  
peacocks, [35](#), [36](#), [41](#), [43](#), [44](#)  
Pérez, Elizabeth, [222](#)  
perfection, [119–20](#)  
Petrzela, Natalia, [148–49](#), [152](#)  
petticoats, [84–87](#)  
Pharrell, [229](#), [230](#)  
*Phil Donahue Show, The*, [169](#)  
physical fitness, *see* [exercise and fitness](#)  
Piccadilly, [53](#), [56](#), [57](#), [59](#), [66](#), [74](#)  
pigs, [21–22](#)  
*Plain Dealer*, [121](#), [122](#)  
Planet Pepper, [137–39](#), [141](#)  
plastic surgery, [103](#), [109](#), [206](#), [212–13](#)  
    butt augmentation, [234–35](#), [297n](#)  
Poiret, Paul, [97](#), [99–100](#), [104](#), [105](#), [160](#)  
pregnancy, [33–34](#), [40](#)  
*Premiere*, [192](#)  
Presley, Elvis, [199](#)  
Prince, [186](#)  
Proust, Marcel, [104](#)  
Prown, Jules, [82](#), [83](#)  
Prum, Richard, [42–45](#), [49](#)  
psychology, evolutionary, [38–41](#), [43](#), [44](#), [72](#)  
  
Quintanilla, Selena, [190–91](#), [200](#)  
  
race and racism, [12](#), [21](#), [51](#), [69–75](#), [183](#), [258n](#)  
    body shape and, [68–69](#)  
    demographic shift in the U.S., [194–96](#), [286n](#)  
    immigrants and, [70](#), [71](#)

skull measurements and, [69](#), [70](#)  
 thinness and, [71](#)  
*see also* [Black people](#); [Black women](#); [whiteness](#)  
*Races of Europe* (Ripley), [70](#)  
 Ray J, [208–9](#)  
 Reaux, S., [61–63](#)  
 rebellion and countercultures, [173](#), [175](#)  
 Red, Katey, [225](#), [237](#)  
 Refinery29, [129](#)  
 Renaissance, [89](#)  
*Revue Nègre, La*, [107–9](#)  
 Rhodes, Cecil, [77](#)  
 Richie, Nicole, [207](#)  
 Riley, Teddy, [186](#)  
 Rimbaud, Arthur, [175](#)  
 Ripley, William Z., [70](#)  
 Robertson, Josephine, [121](#), [122](#)  
 Rose, Tricia, [196](#)  
 Rubens, Peter Paul, [54](#)  
 “Rump Shaker,” [186](#), [188](#)  
 Run-DMC, [188](#)  
 running, [21–23](#), [26–30](#)  
     Man Against Horse Race, [24–27](#), [30](#), [260n](#)  
 RuPaul, [137](#), [141](#)  
 rural areas, migration from, [99](#), [101](#)  
  
*Saturday Night Live*, [192](#)  
*Second Sex, The* (Beauvoir), [141](#)  
 Selena, [190–91](#), [200](#)  
*Selena*, [190–91](#), [194](#)  
 Selter, Jen, [235–36](#)  
*Seventeen*, [175](#), [185](#), [193](#)  
 sexual attraction and evolution, [38–41](#), [44–45](#)  
 sexual characteristics, secondary, [37](#), [72–73](#)  
 sexuality, [97](#), [98](#)  
     of Africans, [54](#), [58](#), [61](#), [65–66](#), [90](#)  
     of Black women, [66](#), [71–73](#), [90](#), [91](#), [110](#), [183](#), [204](#), [232](#), [243](#), [249](#)  
     butts associated with, [66–67](#), [71–73](#), [182](#), [224](#)  
     of East Asian women, [105](#)  
     Ellis’s views on, [72–73](#)  
 sexual reproduction, [33–34](#), [37](#), [44](#), [115](#)  
     eugenics and, [69](#), [73–74](#), [116](#), [117](#), [119–21](#), [123](#)  
 Shapiro, Harry L., [119](#), [120](#), [122](#)  
 Shepherd, Sherri, [231](#)  
 Shields, Brooke, [174](#), [231](#)

Silverstone, Alicia, [206](#)  
*Simple Life, The*, [207](#)  
Simpson, O. J., [207](#)  
Sir Mix-A-Lot, [177–86](#), [189](#), [193](#), [204](#), [214](#), [224](#)  
Sisqó, [194](#)  
Skidmore, Martha, [122–23](#)  
skull measurements, [69](#), [70](#)  
slavery, [52](#), [55](#), [58](#), [61](#), [65](#), [92–93](#), [126](#), [222](#), [243](#)  
    abolitionists and, [58–60](#), [265–66n](#)  
    in New Orleans, [221](#), [222](#), [226](#)  
    in Paris, [61](#), [106](#)  
    rape and, [65](#), [66](#)  
Smikle, Ken, [195](#)  
Smith, Christopher, [183](#)  
Smithey, Greg, [145–48](#), [154–56](#), [249](#)  
Snoop Dogg, [189](#), [205](#)  
social media, [235](#)  
    Instagram, [124](#), [135](#), [211–12](#), [234](#), [236](#)  
Soderbergh, Steven, [191](#), [194](#)  
Somers, Suzanne, [159](#)  
Sorensen, Jacki, [151–53](#)  
South Africa, [51](#), [52](#), [55](#), [62](#), [75–77](#)  
Spieker, Lee, [156](#)  
sports, [151–52](#)  
statuary, [54](#), [89](#), [90](#)  
Steele, Valerie, [103](#)  
stereotypes, [198](#), [243](#)  
    jokes and, [185–86](#)  
    welfare and, [183](#)  
sterilization programs, [74](#), [116](#), [268n](#)  
Stone, Sharon, [192](#)  
Strings, Sabrina, [71](#)  
*Studies in the Psychology of Sex* (Ellis), [72–73](#)  
Supreme Court, [74](#), [268n](#), [290n](#)  
Swain-Lenz, Devjane, [31–32](#)  
  
*Target Market News*, [195](#)  
Tate, Greg, [91](#), [199–200](#)  
Taylor, Henry, [61](#)  
television characters, [195](#)  
Thicke, Robin, [230](#)  
thinness, [54](#), [71](#), [97–98](#), [100](#), [102–4](#), [173–76](#), [206](#), [210](#)  
“Thong Song,” [194](#)  
*Time*, [192](#)  
Tobias, Phillip, [76](#)

Trainor, Meghan, [237](#)  
Turner, Sharon, [70](#)  
twerking, [219–20](#), [224–26](#), [230–33](#), [237](#), [239–45](#)  
2 Live Crew, [186–89](#), [224](#)  
  
underwear, [88](#), [89](#), [100](#)  
Universal Exhibitions, [75](#), [91](#), [104](#)  
University of Colorado Boulder, [29](#)  
University of Texas, [39–41](#)  
Upham, Mansell, [75](#)  
urbanization, [99–101](#)  
USDA, [117](#)  
*Us Weekly*, [209](#)  
  
*Vanity Fair*, [96](#)  
Vaz, Kim Marie, [223](#)  
Venuses, [54](#), [89](#), [90](#), [120](#)  
“Venus Hottentot,” *see* [“Hottentot Venus”](#)  
Victoria & Albert Museum, [83–86](#), [88](#), [89](#), [92](#)  
Victorian era, [66](#), [72](#), [81](#), [88–89](#), [95](#), [99–102](#)  
Vietnam War, [152](#)  
*Vogue*, [96](#), [129](#), [130](#), [173](#), [175](#), [233](#)  
voting rights, [99](#)  
*Vulture*, [178](#), [179](#), [181](#)  
vulva, [71–72](#), [268n](#)  
  
Wagner, Natasha, [129–32](#), [142](#)  
Wahlberg, Mark, [176](#)  
Warrant, “Cherry Pie,” [181](#), [183](#)  
Webb, Tamilee, [156–58](#), [161](#)  
We Dance, [166](#)  
weight, [103–4](#)  
welfare, [183](#)  
West, Cornel, [199](#)  
Whistler, James McNeill, [104](#)  
whiteness, [246](#)  
    Armenians and, [207–8](#), [290n](#)  
    classifications of, [69–70](#), [276n](#)  
    femininity and, [242–43](#), [246](#)  
    as identity, [197–99](#), [288n](#)  
    Kardashians and, [207–8](#)  
Wilde, Oscar, [104](#)  
Wiltz, Teresa, [200–201](#)  
Winfrey, Oprah, [205](#)  
Winthrop, John, [163](#)  
Wojcicki, Susan, [192](#)

work, [99–101](#), [121](#), [148](#)  
Works Progress Administration, [118](#)  
World's Fairs, [115](#), [117](#)  
World War I, [95](#), [101](#), [106](#), [117](#)  
World War II, [73](#), [74](#), [117](#), [223](#)  
    atomic bombs in, [121](#)  
Wreckx-n-Effect, “Rump Shaker,” [186](#), [188](#)  
  
Yale University, [42](#)  
YMCA, [151](#), [167](#)  
*Yo! MTV Raps*, [188–89](#)  
YWCA, [122](#)  
  
Zhu, Huican, [192](#)  
Ziglar, Zig, [147](#)



## AVID READER PRESS

An Imprint of Simon & Schuster, Inc.

1230 Avenue of the Americas

New York, NY 10020

[www.SimonandSchuster.com](http://www.SimonandSchuster.com)

Copyright © 2022 by Heather Radke

“Baby Got Back” Words and Music by Anthony L. Ray Copyright © 1992 UNIVERSAL – SONGS OF POLYGRAM INTERNATIONAL, INC. and MIX-A-LOT MUSIC All Rights Controlled and Administered by UNIVERSAL – SONGS OF POLYGRAM INTERNATIONAL, INC. All Rights Reserved. Used by Permission. *Reprinted by Permission of Hal Leonard LLC*

All rights reserved, including the right to reproduce this book or portions thereof in any form whatsoever. For information, address Avid Reader Press Subsidiary Rights Department, 1230 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10020.

First Avid Reader Press hardcover edition November 2022

AVID READER PRESS and colophon are trademarks of Simon & Schuster, Inc.

For information about special discounts for bulk purchases, please contact Simon & Schuster Special Sales at 1-866-506-1949 or [business@simonandschuster.com](mailto:business@simonandschuster.com).

The Simon & Schuster Speakers Bureau can bring authors to your live event. For more information or to book an event, contact the Simon & Schuster Speakers Bureau at 1-866-248-3049 or visit our website at [www.simonspeakers.com](http://www.simonspeakers.com).

Interior design by Lewelin Polanco

Jacket design by Rodrigo Corral

Author photograph © Andrew Semans

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data has been applied for.

ISBN 978-1-9821-3548-5

ISBN 978-1-9821-3552-2 (ebook)

# Did Six Million Really Die?

*by Richard E. Harwood*

---

Please note: Commercial use and/or exploitation is expressly prohibited by copyright.

---

## [Introduction](#)

1. [German Policy toward the Jews prior to the War](#)
  2. [German Policy toward the Jews after the Outbreak of War](#)
  3. [Population and Emigration](#)
  4. [The Six Million: Documentary Evidence](#)
  5. [The Nuremberg Trials](#)
  6. [Auschwitz and Polish Jewry](#)
  8. [The Nature And aondition of War-Time Concentration Camps](#)
- 

## **Introduction**

Of course, atrocity propaganda is nothing new. It has accompanied every conflict of the 20th century and doubtless will continue to do so. During the First World War, the Germans were actually accused of eating Belgian babies, as well as delighting to throw them in the air and transfix them on bayonets. The British also alleged that the German forces were operating a "Corpse Factory," in which they boiled down the bodies of their own dead in order to obtain glycerine and other commodities, a calculated insult to the honour of an Imperial army. After the war, however, came the retractions; indeed, a public statement was made by the Foreign Secretary in the House of Commons

apologising for the insults to German honour, which were admitted to be war-time propaganda.

No such statements have been made after the Second World War. In fact, rather than diminish with the passage of years, the atrocity propaganda concerning the German occupation, and in particular their treatment of the Jews, has done nothing but increase its virulence, and elaborate its catalogue of horrors. Gruesome paperback books with lurid covers continue to roll from the presses, adding continuously to a growing mythology of the concentration camps and especially to the story that no less than Six Million Jews were exterminated in them. The ensuing pages will reveal this claim to be the most colossal piece of fiction and the most successful of deceptions; but here an attempt may be made to answer an important question: What has rendered the atrocity stories of the Second World War so uniquely different from those of the First? Why were the latter retracted while the former are reiterated louder than ever? Is it possible that the story of the Six Million Jews is serving a political purpose, even that it is a form of political blackmail?

So far as the Jewish people themselves are concerned, the deception has been an incalculable benefit. Every conceivable race and nationality had its share of suffering in the Second World War, but none has so successfully elaborated it and turned it to such great advantage. The alleged extent of their persecution quickly aroused sympathy for the Jewish national homeland they had sought for so long; after the War the British Government did little to prevent Jewish emigration to Palestine which they had declared illegal, and it was not long afterwards that the Zionists wrested from the Government the land of Palestine and created their haven from persecution, the State of Israel. Indeed, it is a remarkable fact that the Jewish people emerged from the Second World War as nothing less than a triumphant minority. Dr. Max Nussbaum, the former chief rabbi of the Jewish community in Berlin, stated on April 11, 1953: "The position the Jewish people occupy today in the world — despite the enormous losses — is ten times stronger than what it was twenty years ago." It should be added, if one is to be honest, that this strength has been much consolidated financially by the supposed massacre of the Six Million, undoubtedly the most profitable atrocity allegation of all time. To date, the staggering figure of six thousand million pounds has been paid out in compensation by the Federal Government of West Germany, mostly to the State of Israel (which did not even exist during the Second World War), as well as to individual Jewish claimants.

## **DISCOURAGEMENT OF NATIONALISM**

In terms of political blackmail, however, the allegation that Six Million Jews died during the Second World War has much more far-reaching implications for the people of Britain and Europe than simply the advantages it has gained for the Jewish nation. And here one comes to the crux of the question: Why the Big Lie? What is its purpose? In the first place, it has been used quite unscrupulously to discourage any form of nationalism. Should the people of Britain or any other European country attempt to assert their patriotism and preserve their national integrity in an age when the very existence of

nation-states is threatened, they are immediately branded as "neo-Nazis". Because, of course, Nazism was nationalism, and we all know what happened then — Six Million Jews were exterminated! So long as the myth is perpetuated, peoples everywhere will remain in bondage to it; the need for international tolerance and understanding will be hammered home by the United Nations until nationhood itself, the very guarantee of freedom, is abolished.

A classic example of the use of the 'Six Million' as an anti-national weapon appears in Manvell and Frankl's book, *The Incomparable Crime* (London, 1967), which deals with 'Genocide in the Twentieth Century.' Anyone with a pride in being British will be somewhat surprised by the vicious attack made on the British Empire in this book. The authors quote Pandit Nehru, who wrote the following while in a British prison in India: "Since Hitler emerged from obscurity and became the Führer of Germany, we have heard a great deal about racialism and the Nazi theory of the 'Herrenvolk' ... But we in India have known racialism in all its forms ever since the commencement of British rule. The whole ideology of this rule was that of the 'Herrenvolk' and the master race ... India as a nation and Indians as individuals were subjected to insult, humiliation and contemptuous treatment. The English were an imperial race, we were told, with the God-given right to govern us and keep us in subjection; if we protested we were reminded of the 'tiger qualities of an imperial race'." The authors Manvell and Frankl then go on to make the point perfectly clear for us: "The white races of Europe and America," they write, "have become used during centuries to regarding themselves as a 'Herrenvolk.' The twentieth century, the century of Auschwitz, has also achieved the first stage in the recognition of multi-racial partnership." (ibid., p. 14)

## **THE RACE PROBLEM SUPPRESSED**

One could scarcely miss the object of this diatribe, with its insidious hint about "multi-racial partnership." Thus the accusation of the Six Million is not only used to undermine the principle of nationhood and national pride, but it threatens the survival of the Race itself. It is wielded over the heads of the populace, rather as the threat of hellfire and damnation was in the Middle Ages. Many countries of the Anglo-Saxon world, notably Britain and America, are today facing the gravest danger in their history, the danger posed by the alien races in their midst. Unless something is done in Britain to halt the immigration and assimilation of Africans and Asians into our country, we are faced in the near future, quite apart from the bloodshed of racial conflict, with the biological alteration and destruction of the British people as they have existed here since the coming of the Saxons. In short, we are threatened with the irrecoverable loss of our European culture and racial heritage. But what happens if a man dares to speak of the race problem, of its biological and political implications? He is branded as that most heinous of creatures, a "racialist." And what is racialism, of course, but the very hallmark of the Nazi! They (so everyone is told, anyway) murdered Six Million Jews because of racialism, so it must be a very evil thing indeed. When Enoch Powell drew attention to the dangers posed by coloured immigration into Britain in one of his early

speeches, a certain prominent Socialist raised the spectre of Dachau and Auschwitz to silence his presumption.

Thus any rational discussion of the problems of Race and the effort to preserve racial integrity is effectively discouraged. No one could have anything but admiration for the way in which the Jews have sought to preserve their race through so many centuries, and continue to do so today. In this effort they have frankly been assisted by the story of the Six .Million, which, almost like a religious myth, has stressed the need for greater Jewish racial solidarity. Unfortunately, it has worked in quite the opposite way for all other peoples, rendering them impotent in the struggle for self-preservation.

The aim in the following pages is quite simply to tell the Truth. The distinguished American historian Harry Elmer Barnes once wrote that "An attempt to make a competent, objective and truthful investigation of the extermination question ... is surely the most precarious venture that an historian or demographer could undertake today." In attempting this precarious task, it is hoped to make some contribution, not only to historical truth, but towards lifting the burden of a lie from our own shoulders, so that we may freely confront the dangers which threaten us all.

*Richard E. Harwood*

## **1. GERMAN POLICY TOWARD THE JEWS PRIOR TO THE WAR**

Rightly or wrongly, the Germany of Adolf Hitler considered the Jews to be a disloyal and avaricious element within the national community, as well as a force of decadence in Germany's cultural life. This was held to be particularly unhealthy since, during the Weimar period, the Jews had risen to a position of remarkable strength and influence in the nation, particularly in law, finance and the mass media, even though they constituted only 5 per cent of the population. The fact that Karl Marx was a Jew and that Jews such as Rosa Luxembourg and Karl Liebknecht were disproportionately prominent in the leadership of revolutionary movements in Germany, also tended to convince the Nazis of the powerful internationalist and Communist tendencies of the Jewish people themselves.

It is no part of the discussion here to argue whether the German attitude to the Jews was right or not, or to judge whether its legislative measures against them were just or unjust. Our concern is simply with the fact that, believing of the Jews as they did, the Nazis' solution to the problem was to deprive them of their influence within the nation by various legislative acts, and most important of all, to encourage their emigration from the country altogether. By 1939, the great majority of German Jews had emigrated, all of them with a sizeable proportion of their assets. Never at any time had the Nazi leadership even contemplated a policy of genocide towards them.

## **JEWS CALLED EMIGRATION 'EXTERMINATION'**

It is very significant, however, that certain Jews were quick to interpret these policies of internal discrimination as equivalent to extermination itself. A 1936 anti-German propaganda book by Leon Feuchtwanger and others entitled *Der Gelbe Fleck: Die Ausrottung von 500,000 deutschen Juden* (The Yellow Spot: The Extermination of 500,000 German Jews, Paris, 1936), presents a typical example. Despite its baselessness in fact, the annihilation of the Jews is discussed from the first pages — straight-forward emigration being regarded as the physical "extermination" of German Jewry. The Nazi concentration camps for political prisoners are also seen as potential instruments of genocide, and special reference is made to the 100 Jews still detained in Dachau in 1936, of whom 60 had been there since 1933. A further example was the sensational book by the German-Jewish Communist, Hans Beimler, called *Four Weeks in the Hands of Hitler's Hell-Hounds: The Nazi Murder Camp of Dachau*, which was published in New York as early as 1933. Detained for his Marxist affiliations, he claimed that Dachau was a death camp, though by his own admission he was released after only a month there. The present regime in East Germany now issues a Hans Beimler Award for services to Communism.

The fact that anti-Nazi genocide propaganda was being disseminated at this impossibly early date, therefore, by people biased on racial or political grounds, should suggest extreme caution to the independent-minded observer when approaching similar stories of the war period.

The encouragement of Jewish emigration should not be confused with the purpose of concentration camps in pre-war Germany. These were used for the detention of political opponents and subversives — principally liberals, Social Democrats and Communists of all kinds, of whom a proportion were Jews such as Hans Beimler. Unlike the millions enslaved in the Soviet Union, the German concentration camp population was always small; Reitinger admits that between 1934 and 1938 it seldom exceeded 20,000 throughout the whole of Germany, and the number of Jews was never more than 3,000. (*The SS: Alibi of a Nation*, London, 1956, p. 253).

## **ZIONIST POLICY STUDIED**

The Nazi view of Jewish emigration was not limited to a negative policy of simple expulsion, but was formulated along the lines of modern Zionism. The founder of political Zionism in the 19th century, Theodore Herzl, in his work *The Jewish State*, had originally conceived of Madagascar as a national homeland for the Jews, and this possibility was seriously studied by the Nazis. It had been a main plank of the National Socialist party platform before 1933 and was published by the party in pamphlet form. This stated that the revival of Israel as a Jewish state was much less acceptable since it would result in perpetual war and disruption in the Arab world, which has indeed been the case. The Germans were not original in proposing Jewish emigration to Madagascar; the Polish Government had already considered the scheme in respect of

their own Jewish population, and in 1937 they sent the Michael Lepecki expedition to Madagascar, accompanied by Jewish representatives, to investigate the problems involved.

The first Nazi proposals for a Madagascar solution were made in association with the Schacht Plan of 1938. On the advice of Göring, Hitler agreed to send the President of the Reichsbank, Dr. Hjalmar Schacht, to London for discussions with Jewish representatives Lord Bearsted and Mr. Rublee of New York (cf. Reitlinger, *The Final Solution*, London, 1953, p. 20). The plan was that German Jewish assets would be frozen as security for an international loan to finance Jewish emigration to Palestine, and Schacht reported on these negotiations to Hitler at Berchtesgaden on January 2, 1939. The plan, which failed due to British refusal to accept the financial terms, was first put forward on November 12, 1938 at a conference convened by Göring, who revealed that Hitler was already considering the emigration of Jews to a settlement in Madagascar (ibid., p. 21). Later, in December, Ribbentrop was told by M. Georges Bonnet, the French Foreign Secretary, that the French Government itself was planning the evacuation of 10,000 Jews to Madagascar.

Prior to the Schacht Palestine proposals of 1938, which were essentially a protraction of discussions that had begun as early as 1935, numerous attempts had been made to secure Jewish emigration to other European nations, and these efforts culminated in the Evian Conference of July, 1938. However, by 1939 the scheme of Jewish emigration to Madagascar had gained the most favour in German circles. It is true that in London Helmuth Wohltat of the German Foreign Office discussed limited Jewish emigration to Rhodesia and British Guiana as late as April 1939; but by January 24th, when Göring wrote to Interior Minister Frick ordering the creation of a Central Emigration Office for Jews, and commissioned Heydrich of the Reich Security Head Office to solve the Jewish problem "by means of emigration and evacuation," the Madagascar Plan was being studied in earnest.

By 1939, the consistent efforts of the German Government to secure the departure of Jews from the Reich had resulted in the emigration of 400,000 German Jews from a total population of about 600,000, and an additional 480,000 emigrants from Austria and Czechoslovakia, which constituted almost their entire Jewish populations. This was accomplished through Offices of Jewish Emigration in Berlin, Vienna and Prague established by Adolf Eichmann, the head of the Jewish Investigation Office of the Gestapo. So eager were the Germans to secure this emigration that Eichmann even established a training centre in Austria, where young Jews could learn farming in anticipation of being smuggled illegally to Palestine (Manvell and Frankl, *SS and Gestapo*, p. 60). Had Hitler cherished any intention of exterminating the Jews, it is inconceivable that he would have allowed more than 800,000 to leave Reich territory with the bulk of their wealth, much less considered plans for their mass emigration to Palestine or Madagascar. What is more, we shall see that the policy of emigration from Europe was still under consideration well into the war period, notably the Madagascar Plan, which Eichmann discussed in 1940 with French Colonial Office experts after the defeat of France had made the surrender of the colony a practical proposition.

## **2. GERMAN POLICY TOWARD THE JEWS AFTER THE OUTBREAK OF WAR**

With the coming of the war, the situation regarding the Jews altered drastically. It is not widely known that world Jewry declared itself to be a belligerent party in the Second World War, and there was therefore ample basis under international law for the Germans to intern the Jewish population as a hostile force. On September 5, 1939 Chaim Weizmann, the principle Zionist leader, had declared war against Germany on behalf of the world's Jews, stating that "the Jews stand by Great Britain and will fight on the side of the democracies ... The Jewish Agency is ready to enter into immediate arrangements for utilizing Jewish manpower, technical ability, resources etc ..." (Jewish Chronicle, September 8, 1939).

### **DETENTION OF ENEMY ALIENS**

All Jews had thus been declared agents willing to prosecute a war against the German Reich, and as a consequence, Himmler and Heydrich were eventually to begin the policy of internment. It is worth noting that the United States and Canada had already interned all Japanese aliens and citizens of Japanese descent in detention camps before the Germans applied the same security measures against the Jews of Europe. Moreover, there had been no such evidence or declaration of disloyalty by these Japanese Americans as had been given by Weizmann. The British, too, during the Boer War, interned all the women and children of the population, and thousands had died as a result, yet in no sense could the British be charged with wanting to exterminate the Boers. The detention of Jews in the occupied territories of Europe served two essential purposes from the German viewpoint. The first was to prevent unrest and subversion; Himmler had informed Mussolini on October 11th, 1942, that German policy toward the Jews had altered during wartime entirely for reasons of military security. He complained that thousands of Jews in the occupied regions were conducting partisan warfare, sabotage and espionage, a view confirmed by official Soviet information given to Raymond Arthur Davis that no less than 35,000 European Jews were waging partisan war under Tito in Yugoslavia. As a result, Jews were to be transported to restricted areas and detention camps, both in Germany, and especially after March 1942, in the Government-General of Poland. As the war proceeded, the policy developed of using Jewish detainees for labour in the war-effort. The question of labour is fundamental when considering the alleged plan of genocide against the Jews, for on grounds of logic alone the latter would entail the most senseless waste of manpower, time and energy while prosecuting a war of survival on two fronts. Certainly after the attack on Russia, the idea of compulsory labour had taken precedence over German plans for Jewish emigration. The protocol of a conversation between Hitler and the Hungarian regent Horthy on April 17th, 1943, reveals that the German leader personally requested Horthy to release 100,000 Hungarian Jews for work in the "pursuit-plane programme" of the Luftwaffe at a time when the aerial bombardment of Germany was increasing



(Reitlinger, *Die Endlösung*, Berlin, 1956, p. 478). This took place at a time when, supposedly, the Germans were already seeking to exterminate the Jews, but Hitler's request clearly demonstrates the priority aim of expanding his labour force. In harmony with this programme, concentration camps became, in fact, industrial complexes. At every camp where Jews and other nationalities were detained, there were large industrial plants and factories supplying material for the German war-effort - the Buna rubber factory at Bergen-Belsen, for example, Buna and I. G. Farben Industrie at Auschwitz and the electrical firm of Siemens at Ravensbruck. In many cases, special concentration camp money notes were issued as payment for labour, enabling prisoners to buy extra rations from camp shops. The Germans were determined to obtain the maximum economic return from the concentration camp system, an object wholly at variance with any plan to exterminate millions of people in them. It was the function of the S.S. Economy and Administration Office, headed by Oswald Pohl, to see that the concentration camps became major industrial producers.

## **EMIGRATION STILL FAVOURED**

It is a remarkable fact, however, that well into the war period, the Germans continued to implement the policy of Jewish emigration. The fall of France in 1940 enabled the German Government to open serious negotiations with the French for the transfer of European Jews to Madagascar. A memorandum of August, 1942 from Luther, Secretary-of-State in the German Foreign Office, reveals that he had conducted these negotiations between July and December 1940, when they were terminated by the French. A circular from Luther's department dated August 15th, 1940 shows that the details of the German plan had been worked out by Eichmann, for it is signed by his assistant, Dannecker. Eichmann had in fact been commissioned in August to draw up a detailed Madagascar Plan, and Dannecker was employed in research on Madagascar at the French Colonial Office (Reitlinger, *The Final Solution*, p. 77). The proposals of August 15th were that an inter-European bank was to finance the emigration of four million Jews throughout a phased programme. Luther's 1942 memorandum shows that Heydrich had obtained Himmler's approval of this plan before the end of August and had also submitted it to Göring. It certainly met with Hitler's approval, for as early as June 17th his interpreter, Schmidt, recalls Hitler observing to Mussolini that "One could found a State of Israel in Madagascar" (Schmidt, *Hitler's Interpreter*, London, 1951, p. 178). Although the French terminated the Madagascar negotiations in December, 1940, Poliakov, the director of the Centre of Jewish Documentation in Paris, admits that the Germans nevertheless pursued the scheme, and that Eichmann was still busy with it throughout 1941. Eventually, however, it was rendered impractical by the progress of the war, in particular by the situation after the invasion of Russia, and on February 10th, 1942, the Foreign Office was informed that the plan had been temporarily shelved. This ruling, sent to the Foreign Office by Luther's assistant, Rademacher, is of great importance, because it demonstrates conclusively that the term "Final Solution" meant only the emigration of Jews, and also that transportation to the eastern ghettos and concentration camps such as Auschwitz constituted nothing but an alternative plan of evacuation. The directive reads: "The war with the Soviet Union has in the meantime

created the possibility of disposing of other territories for the Final Solution. In consequence the Führer has decided that the Jews should be evacuated not to Madagascar but to the East. Madagascar need no longer therefore be considered in connection with the Final Solution" (Reitlinger, *ibid.* p. 79). The details of this evacuation had been discussed a month earlier at the Wannsee Conference in Berlin, which we shall examine below. Reitlinger and Poliakov both make the entirely unfounded supposition that because the Madagascar Plan had been shelved, the Germans must necessarily have been thinking of "extermination". Only a month later, however, on March 7th, 1942, Goebbels wrote a memorandum in favour of the Madagascar Plan as a "final solution" of the Jewish question (Manvell and Frankl, *Dr. Goebbels*, London, 1960, p. 165). In the meantime he approved of the Jews being "concentrated in the East". Later Goebbels memoranda also stress deportation to the East (i.e. the Government-General of Poland) and lay emphasis on the need for compulsory labour there; once the policy of evacuation to the East had been inaugurated, the use of Jewish labour became a fundamental part of the operation. It is perfectly clear from the foregoing that the term "Final Solution" was applied both to Madagascar and to the Eastern territories, and that therefore it meant only the deportation of the Jews. Even as late as May 1944, the Germans were prepared to allow the emigration of one million European Jews from Europe. An account of this proposal is given by Alexander Weissberg, a prominent Soviet Jewish scientist deported during the Stalin purges, in his book *Die Geschichte von Joel Brand* (Cologne, 1956). Weissberg, who spent the war in Cracow though he expected the Germans to intern him in a concentration camp, explains that on the personal authorisation of Himmler, Eichmann had sent the Budapest Jewish leader Joel Brand to Istanbul with an offer to the Allies to permit the transfer of one million European Jews in the midst of the war. (If the 'extermination' writers are to be believed, there were scarcely one million Jews left by May, 1944). The Gestapo admitted that the transportation involved would greatly inconvenience the German war-effort, but were prepared to allow it in exchange for 10,000 trucks to be used exclusively on the Russian front. Unfortunately, the plan came to nothing; the British concluded that Brand must be a dangerous Nazi agent and immediately imprisoned him in Cairo, while the Press denounced the offer as a Nazi trick. Winston Churchill, though orating to the effect that the treatment of the Hungarian Jews was probably "the biggest and most horrible crime ever committed in the whole history of the world", nevertheless told Chaim Weizmann that acceptance of the Brand offer was impossible, since it would be a betrayal of his Russian Allies. Although the plan was fruitless, it well illustrates that no one allegedly carrying out "thorough" extermination would permit the emigration of a million Jews, and it demonstrates, too, the prime importance placed by the Germans on the war-effort.

### **3. POPULATION AND EMIGRATION**

Statistics relating to Jewish populations are not everywhere known in precise detail, approximations for various countries differing widely, and it is also unknown exactly how many Jews were deported and interned at any one time between the years 1939-1945. In general, however, what reliable statistics there are, especially those relating to

emigration, are sufficient to show that not a fraction of six million Jews could have been exterminated. In the first place, this claim cannot remotely be upheld on examination of the European Jewish population figures. According to Chambers Encyclopaedia the total number of Jews living in pre-war Europe was 6,500,000. Quite clearly, this would mean that almost the entire number were exterminated. But the Baseler Nachrichten, a neutral Swiss publication employing available Jewish statistical data, establishes that between 1933 and 1945, 1,500,000 Jews emigrated to Britain, Sweden, Spain, Portugal, Australia, China, India, Palestine and the United States. This is confirmed by the Jewish journalist Bruno Blau, who cites the same figure in the New York Jewish paper Aufbau, August 13th, 1948. Of these emigrants, approximately 400,000 came from Germany before September 1939. This is acknowledged by the World Jewish Congress in its publication Unity in Dispersion (p. 377), which states that: "The majority of the German Jews succeeded in leaving Germany before the war broke out." In addition to the German Jews, 220,000 of the total 280,000 Austrian Jews had emigrated by September, 1939, while from March 1939 onwards the Institute for Jewish Emigration in Prague had secured the emigration of 260,000 Jews from former Czechoslovakia. In all, only 360,000 Jews remained in Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia after September 1939. From Poland, an estimated 500,000 had emigrated prior to the outbreak of war. These figures mean that the number of Jewish emigrants from other European countries (France, the Netherlands, Italy, the countries of eastern Europe etc.) was approximately 120,000. This exodus of Jews before and during hostilities, therefore, reduces the number of Jews in Europe to approximately 5,000,000. In addition to these emigrants, we must also include the number of Jews who fled to the Soviet Union after 1939, and who were later evacuated beyond reach of the German invaders. It will be shown below that the majority of these, about 1,250,000, were migrants from Poland. But apart from Poland, Reitlinger admits that 300,000 other European Jews slipped into Soviet territory between 1939 and 1941. This brings the total of Jewish emigrants to the Soviet Union to about 1,550,000. In Colliers magazine, June 9th, 1945, Freiling Foster, writing of the Jews in Russia, explained that "2,200,000 have migrated to the Soviet Union since 1939 to escape from the Nazis," but our lower estimate is probably more accurate. Jewish migration to the Soviet Union, therefore, reduces the number of Jews within the sphere of German occupation to around 3-1/2 million, approximately 3,450,000. From these should be deducted those Jews living in neutral European countries who escaped the consequences of the war. According to the 1942 World Almanac (p. 594), the number of Jews living in Gibraltar, Britain, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ireland and Turkey was 413,128.

### **3 MILLION JEWS IN EUROPE**

A figure, consequently, of around 3 million Jews in German-occupied Europe is as accurate as the available emigration statistics will allow. Approximately the same number, however, can be deduced in another way if we examine statistics for the Jewish populations remaining in countries occupied by the Reich. More than half of those Jews who migrated to the Soviet Union after 1939 came from Poland. It is frequently claimed that the war with Poland added some 3 million Jews to the German

sphere of influence and that almost the whole of this Polish Jewish population was "exterminated". This is a major factual error. The 1931 Jewish population census for Poland put the number of Jews at 2,732,600 (Reitlinger, *Die Endlösung*, p. 36). Reitlinger states that at least 1,170,000 of these were in the Russian zone occupied in the autumn of 1939, about a million of whom were evacuated to the Urals and south Siberia after the German invasion of June 1941 (*ibid.* p. 50). As described above, an estimated 500,000 Jews had emigrated from Poland prior to the war. Moreover, the journalist Raymond Arthur Davis, who spent the war in the Soviet Union, observed that approximately 250,000 had already fled from German-occupied Poland to Russia between 1939 and 1941 and were to be encountered in every Soviet province (*Odyssey through Hell*, N.Y., 1946). Subtracting these figures from the population of 2,732,600, therefore, and allowing for the normal population increase, no more than 1,100,000 Polish Jews could have been under German rule at the end of 1939. (Gutachen des Instituts für Zeitgeschichte, Munich, 1956, p.80). To this number we may add the 360,000 Jews remaining in Germany, Austria and former Czechoslovakia (Bohemia-Moravia and Slovakia) after the extensive emigration from those countries prior to the war described above. Of the 320,000 French Jews, the Public Prosecutor representing that part of the indictment relating to France at the Nuremberg Trials, stated that 120,000 Jews were deported, though. Reitlinger estimates only about 50,000. Thus the total number of Jews under Nazi rule remains below two million. Deportations from the Scandinavian countries were few, and from Bulgaria none at all. When the Jewish populations of Holland (140,000), Belgium (40,000), Italy (50,000), Yugoslavia (55,000), Hungary (380,000) and Roumania (725,000) are included, the figure does not much exceed 3 million. This excess is due to the fact that the latter figures are pre-war estimates unaffected by emigration, which from these countries accounted for about 120,000 (see above). This cross-checking, therefore, confirms the estimate of approximately 3 million European Jews under German occupation.

## **RUSSIAN JEWS EVACUATED**

The precise figures concerning Russian Jews are unknown, and have therefore been the subject of extreme exaggeration. The Jewish statistician Jacob Leszczyński states that in 1939 there were 2,100,000 Jews living in future German-occupied Russia, i.e. western Russia. In addition, some 260,000 lived in the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. According to Louis Levine, President of the American Jewish Council for Russian Relief, who made a post-war tour of the Soviet Union and submitted a report on the status of Jews there, the majority of these numbers were evacuated east after the German armies launched their invasion. In Chicago, on October 30th, 1946, he declared that: "At the outset of the war, Jews were amongst the first evacuated from the western regions threatened by the Hitlerite invaders, and shipped to safety east of the Urals. Two million Jews were thus saved." This high number is confirmed by the Jewish journalist David Bergelson, who wrote in the Moscow Yiddish paper *Ainikeit*, December 5th, 1942, that "Thanks to the evacuation, the majority (80%) of the Jews in the Ukraine, White Russia, Lithuania and Latvia before the arrival of the Germans were rescued." Reitlinger agrees with the Jewish authority Joseph Schechtmann, who admits that huge

numbers were evacuated, though he estimates a slightly higher number of Russian and Baltic Jews left under German occupation, between 650,000 and 850,000 (Reitlinger, *The Final Solution*, p. 499). In respect of these Soviet Jews remaining in German territory, it will be proved later that in the war in Russia no more than one hundred thousand persons were killed by the German Action Groups as partisans and Bolshevik commissars, not all of whom were Jews. By contrast, the partisans themselves claimed to have murdered five times that number of German troops.

## **'SIX MILLION' UNTRUE ACCORDING TO NEUTRAL SWISS**

It is clear, therefore, that the Germans could not possibly have gained control over or exterminated anything like six million Jews. Excluding the Soviet Union, the number of Jews in Nazi-occupied Europe after emigration was scarcely more than 3 million, by no means all of whom were interned. To approach the extermination of even half of six million would have meant the liquidation of every Jew living in Europe. And yet it is known that large numbers of Jews were alive in Europe after 1945. Philip Friedmann in *Their Brother's Keepers* (N.Y., 1957, p. 13), states that "at least a million Jews survived in the very crucible of the Nazi hell," while the official figure of the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee is 1,559,600. Thus, even if one accepts the latter estimate, the number of possible wartime Jewish deaths could not have exceeded a limit of one and a half million. Precisely this conclusion was reached by the reputable journal *Baseler Nachrichten* of neutral Switzerland. In an article entitled "Wie hoch ist die Zahl der jüdischen Opfer?" ("How high is the number of Jewish victims?", June 13th, 1946), it explained that purely on the basis of the population and emigration figures described above, a maximum of only one and a half million Jews could be numbered as casualties. Later on, however, it will be demonstrated conclusively that the number was actually far less, for the *Baseler Nachrichten* accepted the Joint Distribution Committee's figure of 1,559,600 survivors after the war, but we shall show that the number of claims for compensation by Jewish survivors is more than double that figure. This information was not available to the Swiss in 1946.

## **IMPOSSIBLE BIRTH RATE**

Indisputable evidence is also provided by the post-war world Jewish population statistics. The *World Almanac* of 1938 gives the number of Jews in the world as 16,588,259. But after the war, the *New York Times*, February 22nd, 1948 placed the number of Jews in the world at a minimum of 15,600,000 and a maximum of 18,700,000. Quite obviously, these figures make it impossible for the number of Jewish war-time casualties to be measured in anything but thousands. 15-1/2 million in 1938 minus the alleged six million leaves nine million; the *New York Times* figures would mean, therefore, that the world's Jews produced seven million births, almost doubling their numbers, in the space of ten years. This is patently ridiculous. It would appear, therefore, that the great majority of the missing "six million" were in fact emigrants — emigrants to European countries, to the Soviet Union and the United States before,

during and after the war. And emigrants also, in vast numbers to Palestine during and especially at the end of the war. After 1945, boat-loads of these Jewish survivors entered Palestine illegally from Europe, causing considerable embarrassment to the British Government of the time; indeed, so great were the numbers that the H.M. Stationery Office publication No. 190 (November 5th, 1946) described them as "almost amounting to a second Exodus." It was these emigrants to all parts of the world who had swollen the world Jewish population to between 15 and 18 millions by 1948, and probably the greatest part of them were emigrants to the United States who entered in violation of the quota laws. On August 16th, 1963 David Ben Gurion, President of Israel, stated that although the official Jewish population of America was said to be 5,600,000, "the total number would not be estimated too high at 9,000,000" (*Deutsche Wochenzeitung*, November 23rd, 1963). The reason for this high figure is underlined by Albert Maisal in his article "Our Newest Americans" (*Readers Digest*, January, 1957), for he reveals that "Soon after World War II, by Presidential decree, 90 per cent of all quota visas for central and eastern Europe were issued to the uprooted." Reprinted on this page is just one extract from hundreds that regularly appear in the obituary columns of *Aufbau*, the Jewish American weekly published in New York (June 16th, 1972). It shows how Jewish emigrants to the United States subsequently changed their names; their former names when in Europe appear in brackets. For example, as below: Arthur Kingsley (formerly Dr. Königsberger of Frankfurt). Could it be that some or all of these people whose names are 'deceased' were included in the missing six million of Europe?

#### **4. THE SIX MILLION: DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE**

From the foregoing it would seem certain that the figure of six million murdered Jews amounts to nothing more than a vague compromise between several quite baseless estimates; there is not a shred of documentary evidence for it that is trustworthy. Occasionally, writers narrow it down to give a disarming appearance of authenticity. Lord Russell of Liverpool, for example, in his *The Scourge of the Swastika* (London, 1954) claimed that "not less than five million" Jews died in German concentration camps, having satisfied himself that he was somewhere between those who estimated 6 million and those who preferred 4 million. But, he admitted, "the real number will never be known." If so, it is difficult to know how he could have asserted "not less than five million." The Joint Distribution Committee favours 5,012,000, but the Jewish "expert" Reitlinger suggests a novel figure of 4,192,200 "missing Jews" of whom an estimated one third died of natural causes. This would reduce the number deliberately "exterminated" to 2,796,000. However, Dr. M. Perlzweig, the New York delegate to a World Jewish Congress press conference held at Geneva in 1948 stated: "The price of the downfall of National Socialism and Fascism is the fact that seven million Jews lost their lives thanks to cruel Anti-Semitism." In the Press and elsewhere, the figure is often casually lifted to eight million or sometimes even nine million. As we have proved in the previous chapter, none of these figures are in the remotest degree plausible, indeed, they are ridiculous.

## FANTASTIC EXAGGERATIONS

So far as is known, the first accusation against the Germans of the mass murder of Jews in war-time Europe was made by the Polish Jew Rafael Lemkin in his book *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*, published in New York in 1943. Somewhat coincidentally, Lemkin was later to draw up the U.N. Genocide Convention, which seeks to outlaw "racialism". His book claimed that the Nazis had destroyed millions of Jews, perhaps as many as six millions. This, by 1943, would have been remarkable indeed, since the action was allegedly started only in the summer of 1942. At such a rate, the entire world Jewish population would have been exterminated by 1945. After the war, propaganda estimates spiralled to heights even more fantastic. Kurt Gerstein, an anti-Nazi who claimed to have infiltrated the S.S., told the French interrogator Raymond Cartier that he knew that no less than forty million concentration camp internees had been gassed. In his first signed memorandum of April 26th, 1945, he reduced the figure to 25 million, but even this was too bizarre for French Intelligence and in his second memorandum, signed at Rottweil on May 4th, 1945, he brought the figure closer to the six million preferred at the Nuremberg Trials. Gerstein's sister was congenitally insane and died by euthenasia, which may well suggest a streak of mental instability in Gerstein himself. He had, in fact, been convicted in 1936 of sending eccentric mail through the post. After his two "confessions" he hanged himself at Cherche Midi prison in Paris. Gerstein alleged that during the war he passed on information concerning the murder of Jews to the Swedish Government through a German baron but for some inexplicable reason his report was "filed away and forgotten". He also claimed that in August 1942 he informed the Papal nuncio in Berlin about the whole "extermination programme", but the reverend person merely told him to "Get out." The Gerstein statements abound with claims to have witnessed the most gigantic mass executions (twelve thousand in a single day at Belzec), while the second memorandum describes a visit by Hitler to a concentration camp in Poland on June 6th, 1942 which is known never to have taken place. Gerstein's fantastic exaggerations have done little but discredit the whole notion of mass extermination. Indeed, Evangelical Bishop Wilhelm Dibelius of Berlin denounced his memoranda as "Untrustworthy" (H. Rothfels, "Augenzeugenbericht zu den Massenvergasungen" in *Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, April 1953). It is an incredible fact, however, that in spite of this denunciation, the German Government in 1955 issued an edition of the second Gerstein memorandum for distribution in German schools (*Dokumentation zur Massenvergasung*, Bonn, 1955). In it they stated that Dibelius placed his special confidence in Gerstein and that the memoranda were "valid beyond any doubt." This is a striking example of the way in which the baseless charge of genocide by the Nazis is perpetuated in Germany, and directed especially to the youth.

The story of six million Jews exterminated during the war was given final authority at the Nuremberg Trials by the statement of Dr. Wilhelm Hoettl. He had been an assistant of Eichmann's, but was in fact a rather strange person in the service of American Intelligence who had written several books under the pseudonym of Walter Hagen. Hoettl also worked for Soviet espionage, collaborating with two Jewish emigrants from Vienna, Perger and Verber, who acted as U.S. officers during the preliminary inquiries

of the Nuremberg Trials. It is remarkable that the testimony of this highly dubious person Hoettl is said to constitute the only "proof" regarding the murder of six million Jews. In his affidavit of November 26th, 1945 he stated, not that he knew but that Eichmann had "told him" in August 1944 in Budapest that a total of 6 million Jews had been exterminated. Needless to say, Eichmann never corroborated this claim at his trial. Hoettl was working as an American spy during the whole of the latter period of the war, and it is therefore very odd indeed that he never gave the slightest hint to the Americans of a policy to murder Jews, even though he worked directly under Heydrich and Eichmann.

## **ABSENCE OF EVIDENCE**

It should be emphasised straight away that there is not a single document in existence which proves that the Germans intended to, or carried out, the deliberate murder of Jews. In Poliakov and Wulf's *Das Dritte Reich und die Juden: Dokumente und Aufsätze* (Berlin, 1955), the most that they can assemble are statements extracted after the war from people like Hoettl, Ohlendorf and Wisliceny, the latter under torture in a Soviet prison. In the absence of any evidence, therefore, Poliakov is forced to write: "The three or four people chiefly involved in drawing up the plan for total extermination are dead, and no documents survive." This seems very convenient. Quite obviously, both the plan and the "three or four" people are nothing but nebulous assumptions on the part of the writer, and are entirely unprovable. The documents which do survive, of course, make no mention at all of extermination, so that writers like Poliakov and Reitlinger again make the convenient assumption that such orders were generally "verbal". Though lacking any documentary proof, they assume that a plan to murder Jews must have originated in 1941, coinciding with the attack on Russia. Phase one of the plan is alleged to have involved the massacre of Soviet Jews, a claim we shall disprove later. The rest of the programme is supposed to have begun in March 1942, with the deportation and concentration of European Jews in the eastern camps of the Polish Government-General, such as the giant industrial complex at Auschwitz near Cracow. The fantastic and quite groundless assumption throughout is that transportation to the East, supervised by Eichmann's department, actually meant immediate extermination in ovens on arrival. According to Manvell and Frankl (Heinrich Himmler. London, 1965), the policy of genocide "seems to have been arrived at" after "secret discussions" between Hitler and Himmler (p. 118), though they fail to prove it. Reitlinger and Poliakov guess along similar "verbal" lines, adding that no one else was allowed to be present at these discussions, and no records were ever kept of them. This is the purest invention, for there is not a shred of evidence that even suggests such outlandish meetings took place. William Shirer, in his generally wild and irresponsible book *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, is similarly muted on the subject of documentary proof. He states weakly that Hitler's supposed order for the murder of Jews "apparently was never committed to paper — at least no copy of it has yet been unearthed. It was probably given verbally to Göring, Himmler and Heydrich, who passed it down . . .", (p. 1148). A typical example of the kind of "proof" quoted in support of the extermination legend is given by Manvell and Frankl. They cite a memorandum of 31st July, 1941 sent by



Göring to Heydrich, who headed the Reich Security Head Office and was Himmler's deputy. Significantly, the memorandum begins: "Supplementing the task that was assigned to you on 24th January 1939, to solve the Jewish problem by means of emigration and evacuation in the best possible way according to present conditions ...". The supplementary task assigned in the memorandum is a "total solution" (Gesamtlösung) of the Jewish question within the area of German influence in Europe," which the authors admit means concentration in the East, and it requests preparations for the "organisational, financial and material matters" involved. The memorandum then requests a future plan for the "desired final solution" (Endlösung), which clearly refers to the ideal and ultimate scheme of emigration and evacuation mentioned at the beginning of the directive. No mention whatever is made of murdering people, but Manvell and Frankl assure us that this is what the memorandum is really about. Again, of course, the "true nature" of the final as distinct from the total solution "was made known to Heydrich by Göring verbally" (ibid, p. 118). The convenience of these "verbal" directives issuing back and forth is obvious.

## THE WANNSEE CONFERENCE

The final details of the plan to exterminate Jews were supposed to have been made at a conference at Gross Wannsee in Berlin on 20th January, 1942, presided over by Heydrich (Poliakov, *Das Dritte Reich und die Juden*, p. 120 ff; Reitlinger, *The Final Solution*, p. 95 ff). Officials of all German Ministries were present, and Müller and Eichmann represented Gestapo Head Office. Reitlinger and Manvell and Frankl consider the minutes of this conference to be their trump card in proving the existence of a genocide plan, but the truth is that no such plan was even mentioned, and what is more, they freely admit this. Manvell and Frankl explain it away rather lamely by saying that "The minutes are shrouded in the form of officialdom that cloaks the real significance of the words and terminology that are used" (*The Incomparable Crime*, London, 1967, p. 46), which really means that they intend to interpret them in their own way. What Heydrich actually said was that, as in the memorandum quoted above, he had been commissioned by Göring to arrange a solution to the Jewish problem. He reviewed the history of Jewish emigration, stated that the war had rendered the Madagascar project impractical, and continued: "The emigration programme has been replaced now by the evacuation of Jews to the east as a further possible solution, in accordance with the previous authorisation of the Führer." Here, he explained, their labour was to be utilised. All this is supposed to be deeply sinister, and pregnant with the hidden meaning that the Jews were to be exterminated, though Prof. Paul Rassinier, a Frenchman interned at Buchenwald who has done sterling work in refuting the myth of the Six Million, explains that it means precisely what it says, i.e. the concentration of the Jews for labour in the immense eastern ghetto of the Polish Government-General. "There they were to wait until the end of the war, for the re-opening of international discussions which would decide their future. This decision was finally reached at the interministerial Berlin-Wannsee conference ..." (Rassinier, *Le Vêritable Procès Eichmann*, p. 20). Manvell and Frankl, however, remain undaunted by the complete lack of reference to extermination. At the Wannsee conference, they write, "Direct references

to killing were avoided, Heydrich favouring the term "Arbeitseinsatz im Osten" (labour assignment in the East)" (Heinrich Himmler, p. 209). Why we should not accept labour assignment in the East to mean labour assignment in the East is not explained. According to Reitlinger and others, innumerable directives actually specifying extermination then passed between Himmler, Heydrich, Eichmann and commandant Höss in the subsequent months of 1942, but of course, "none have survived".

## **TWISTED WORDS AND GROUNDLESS ASSUMPTIONS**

The complete lack of documentary evidence to support the existence of an extermination plan has led to the habit of re-interpreting the documents that do survive. For example, it is held that a document concerning deportation is not about deportation at all, but a cunning way of talking about extermination. Manvell and Frankl state that "various terms were used to camouflage genocide. These included "Aussiedlung"(desettlement) and "Abbeförderung" (removal)" (ibid, p. 265). Thus, as we have seen already, words are no longer assumed to mean what they say if they prove too inconvenient. This kind of thing is taken to the most incredible extremes, such as their interpretation of Heydrich's directive for labour assignment in the East. Another example is a reference to Himmler's order for sending deportees to the East, "that is, having them killed" (ibid, p. 251). Reitlinger, equally at a loss for evidence, does exactly the same, declaring that from the "circumlocutionary" words of the Wannsee conference it is obvious that "the slow murder of an entire race was intended" (ibid, p. 98). A review of the documentary situation is important, because it reveals the edifice of guesswork and baseless assumptions upon which the extermination legend is built. The Germans had an extraordinary propensity for recording everything on paper in the most careful detail, yet among the thousands of captured documents of the S.D. and Gestapo, the records of the Reich Security Head Office, the files of Himmler's headquarters and Hitler's own war directives there is not a single order for the extermination of Jews or anyone else. It will be seen later that this has, in fact, been admitted by the World Centre of Contemporary Jewish Documentation at Tel-Aviv. Attempts to find "veiled allusions" to genocide in speeches like that of Himmler's to his S.S. Obergruppenführers at Posen in 1943 are likewise quite hopeless. Nuremberg statements extracted after the war, invariably under duress, are examined in the following chapter.

## **5. THE NUREMBERG TRIALS**

The story of the Six Million was given judicial authority at the Nuremberg Trials of German leaders between 1945 and 1949, proceedings which proved to be the most disgraceful legal farce in history. For a far more detailed study of the iniquities of these trials, which as Field Marshal Montgomery said, made it a crime to lose a war, the reader is referred to the works cited below, and particularly to the outstanding book *Advance to Barbarism* (Nelson, 1953), by the distinguished English jurist, F. J. P. Veale. From the very outset, the Nuremberg Trials proceeded on the basis of gross statistical errors. In his speech of indictment on November 20th, 1945, Mr. Sidney Alderman

declared that there had been 9,600,000 Jews living in German occupied Europe. Our earlier study has shown this figure to be wildly inaccurate. It is arrived at (a) by completely ignoring all Jewish emigration between 1933 and 1945, and (b) by adding all the Jews of Russia, including the two million or more who were never in German-occupied territory. The same inflated figure, slightly enlarged to 9,800,000, was produced again at the Eichmann Trial in Israel by Prof. Shalom Baron. The alleged Six Million victims first appeared as the foundation for the prosecution at Nuremberg, and after some dalliance with ten million or more by the Press at the time, it eventually gained international popularity and acceptance. It is very significant, however, that, although this outlandish figure was able to win credence in the reckless atmosphere of recrimination in 1945, it had become no longer tenable by 1961, at the Eichmann Trial. The Jerusalem court studiously avoided mentioning the figure of Six Million, and the charge drawn up by Mr. Gideon Haussner simply said "some" millions.

## LEGAL PRINCIPLES IGNORED

Should anyone be misled into believing that the extermination of the Jews was "proved" at Nuremberg by "evidence," he should consider the nature of the Trials themselves, based as they were on a total disregard of sound legal principles of any kind. The accusers acted as prosecutors, judges and executioners; "guilt" was assumed from the outset. (Among the judges, of course, were the Russians, whose numberless crimes included the massacre of 15,000 Polish officers, a proportion of whose bodies were discovered by the Germans at Katyn Forest, near Smolensk. The Soviet Prosecutor attempted to blame this slaughter on the German defendants). At Nuremberg, *ex post facto* legislation was created, whereby men were tried for "crimes" which were only declared crimes after they had been allegedly committed. Hitherto it had been the most basic legal principle that a person could only be convicted for infringing a law that was in force at the time of the infringement. "Nulla Poena Sine Lege." The Rules of Evidence, developed by British jurisprudence over the centuries in order to arrive at the truth of a charge with as much certainty as possible, were entirely disregarded at Nuremberg. It was decreed that "the Tribunal should not be bound by technical rules of evidence" but could admit "any evidence which it deemed to have probative value," that is, would support a conviction. In practise, this meant the admittance of hearsay evidence and documents, which in a normal judicial trial are always rejected as untrustworthy. That such evidence was allowed is of profound significance, because it was one of the principal methods by which the extermination legend was fabricated through fraudulent "written affidavits." Although only 240 witnesses were called in the course of the Trials, no less than 300,000 of these "written affidavits" were accepted by the Court as supporting the charges, without this evidence being heard under oath. Under these circumstances, any Jewish deportee or camp inmate could make any revengeful allegation that he pleased. Most incredible of all, perhaps, was the fact that defence lawyers at Nuremberg were not permitted to cross-examine prosecution witnesses. A somewhat similar situation prevailed at the trial of Adolf Eichmann, when it was announced that Eichmann's defence lawyer could be cancelled at any time "if an intolerable situation should arise," which presumably meant if his lawyer started to prove

his innocence. The real background of the Nuremberg Trials was exposed by the American judge, Justice Wenersturm, President of one of Tribunals. He was so disgusted by the proceedings that he resigned his appointment and flew home to America, leaving behind a statement to the Chicago Tribune which enumerated point by point his objections to the Trials (cf Mark Lautern, *Das Letzte Wort über Nürnberg*, p. 56). Points 3 -8 are as follows:

3. The members of the department of the Public Prosecutor, instead of trying to formulate and reach a new guiding legal principle, were moved only by personal ambition and revenge.
4. The prosecution did its utmost in every way possible to prevent the defence preparing its case and to make it impossible for it to furnish evidence.
5. The prosecution, led by General Taylor, did everything in its power to prevent the unanimous decision of the Military Court being carried out i.e. to ask Washington to furnish and make available to the court further documentary evidence in the possession of the American Government.
6. Ninety per cent of the Nuremberg Court consisted of biased persons who, either on political or racial grounds, furthered the prosecution's case.
7. The prosecution obviously knew how to fill all the administrative posts of the Military Court with "Americans" whose naturalisation certificates were very new indeed, and who, whether in the administrative service or by their translations etc., created an atmosphere hostile to the accused persons.
8. The real aim of the Nuremberg Trials was to show the Germans the crimes of their Führer, and this aim was at the same time the pretext on which the trials were ordered "... Had I known seven months earlier what was happening at Nuremberg, I would never have gone there."

Concerning Point 6, that ninety per cent of the Nuremberg Court consisted of people biased on racial or political grounds, this was a fact confirmed by others present. According to Earl Carrol, an American lawyer, sixty per cent of the staff of the Public Prosecutor's Office were German Jews who had left Germany after the promulgation of Hitler's Race Laws. He observed that not even ten per cent of the Americans employed at the Nuremberg courts were actually Americans by birth. The chief of the Public Prosecutor's Office, who worked behind General Taylor, was Robert M. Kempner, a German-Jewish emigrant. He was assisted by Morris Amchan. Mark Lautern, who observed the Trials, writes in his book: "They have all arrived: the Solomons, the Schlossbergers and the Rabinovitches, members of the Public Prosecutor's staff ..." (ibid. p. 68). It is obvious from these facts that the fundamental legal principle: that no man can sit in judgment on his own case, was abandoned altogether. Moreover, the majority of witnesses were also Jews. According to Prof. Maurice Bardeche, who was also an observer at the Trials, the only concern of these witnesses was not to show their

hatred too openly, and to try and give an impression of objectivity (Nuremberg ou la Terre Promise, Paris, 1948, p. 149).

## **'CONFESSIONS' UNDER TORTURE**

Altogether more disturbing, however, were the methods employed to extract statements and "confessions" at Nuremberg, particularly those from S.S. officers which were used to support the extermination charge. The American Senator, Joseph McCarthy, in a statement given to the American Press on May 20th, 1949, drew attention to the following cases of torture to secure such confessions. In the prison of the Swabisch Hall, he stated, officers of the S.S. Leibstandarte Adolf Hitler were flogged until they were soaked in blood, after which their sexual organs were trampled on as they lay prostrate on the ground. As in the notorious Malmedy Trials of private soldiers, the prisoners were hoisted in the air and beaten until they signed the confessions demanded of them. On the basis of such "confessions" extorted from S.S. Generals Sepp Dietrich and Joachim Paiper, the Leibstandarte was convicted as a "guilty organisation". S.S. General Oswald Pohl, the economic administrator of the concentration camp system, had his face smeared with faeces and was subsequently beaten until he supplied his confession. In dealing with these cases, Senator McCarthy told the Press: "I have heard evidence and read documentary proofs to the effect that the accused persons were beaten up, maltreated and physically tortured by methods which could only be conceived in sick brains. They were subjected to mock trials and pretended executions, they were told their families would be deprived of their ration cards. All these things were carried out with the approval of the Public Prosecutor in order to secure the psychological atmosphere necessary for the extortion of the required confessions. If the United States lets such acts committed by a few people go unpunished, then the whole world can rightly criticise us severely and forever doubt the correctness of our motives and our moral integrity." The methods of intimidation described were repeated during trials at Frankfurt-am-Mein and at Dachau, and large numbers of Germans were convicted for atrocities on the basis of their admissions. The American Judge Edward L. van Roden, one of the three members of the Simpson Army Commission which was subsequently appointed to investigate the methods of justice at the Dachau trials, revealed the methods by which these admissions were secured in the Washington Daily News, January 9th, 1949. His account also appeared in the British newspaper, the Sunday Pictorial, January 23rd, 1949. The methods he described were: "Posturing as priests to hear confessions and give absolution; torture with burning matches driven under the prisoners finger-nails; knocking out of teeth and breaking jaws; solitary confinement and near starvation rations." Van Roden explained: "The statements which were admitted as evidence were obtained from men who had first been kept in solitary confinement for three, four and five months ... The investigators would put a black hood over the accused's head and then punch him in the face with brass knuckles, kick him and beat him with rubber hoses ... All but two of the Germans, in the 139 cases we investigated, had been kicked in the testicles beyond repair. This was standard operating procedure with our American investigators." The "American" investigators responsible (and who later functioned as the prosecution in the trials)

were: Lt.-Col. Burton F. Ellis (chief of the War Crimes Committee) and his assistants, Capt. Raphael Shumacker, Lt. Robert E. Byrne, Lt. William R. Perl, Mr. Morris Ellowitz, Mr. Harry Thon, and Mr. Kirschbaum. The legal adviser of the court was Col. A. H. Rosenfeld. The reader will immediately appreciate from their names that the majority of these people were "biased on racial grounds" in the words of Justice Wenersturm — that is, were Jewish, and therefore should never have been involved in any such investigation. Despite the fact that "confessions" pertaining to the extermination of the Jews were extracted under these conditions, Nuremberg statements are still regarded as conclusive evidence for the Six Million by writers like Reitlinger and others, and the illusion is maintained that the Trials were both impartial and impeccably fair. When General Taylor, the Chief Public Prosecutor, was asked where he had obtained the figure of the Six Million, he replied that it was based on the confession of S.S. General Otto Ohlendorf. He, too, was tortured and his case is examined below. But as far as such "confessions" in general are concerned, we can do no better than quote the British Sunday Pictorial when reviewing the report of Judge van Roden: "Strong men were reduced to broken wrecks ready to mumble any admission demanded by their prosecutors."

## **THE WISLICENY STATEMENT**

At this point, let us turn to some of the Nuremberg documents themselves. The document quoted most frequently in support of the legend of the Six Million, and which figures largely in Poliakov and Wulf's *Das Dritte Reich und die Juden: Dokumente und Aufsätze*, is the statement of S.S. Captain Dieter Wisliceny, an assistant in Adolf Eichmann's office and later the Gestapo chief in Slovakia. It was obtained under conditions even more extreme than those described above, for Wisliceny fell into the hands of Czech Communists and was "interrogated" at the Soviet-controlled Bratislava Prison in November, 1946. Subjected to torture, Wisliceny was reduced to a nervous wreck and became addicted to uncontrollable fits of sobbing for hours on end prior to his execution. Although the conditions under which his statement was obtained empty it entirely of all plausibility, Poliakov prefers to ignore this and merely writes: "In prison he wrote several memoirs that contain information of great interest" (*Harvest of Hate*, p. 3). These memoirs include some genuine statements of fact to provide authenticity, such as that Himmler was an enthusiastic advocate of Jewish emigration and that the emigration of Jews from Europe continued throughout the war, but in general they are typical of the Communist-style "confession" produced at Soviet show-trials. Frequent reference is made to exterminating Jews and a flagrant attempt is made to implicate as many S.S. leaders as possible. Factual errors are also common, notably the statement that the war with Poland added more than 3 million Jews to the German-occupied territory, which we have disproved above.

## THE CASE OF THE EINSATZGRUPPEN

The Wisliceny statement deals at some length with the activities of the Einsatzgruppen or Action Groups used in the Russian campaign. These must merit a detailed consideration in a survey of Nuremberg because the picture presented of them at the Trials represents a kind of "Six Million" in miniature, i.e. has been proved since to be the most enormous exaggeration and falsification. The Einsatzgruppen were four special units drawn from the Gestapo and the S.D. (S.S. Security Service) whose task was to wipe out partisans and Communist commissars in the wake of the advancing German armies in Russia. As early as 1939, there had been 34,000 of these political commissars attached to the Red Army. The activities of the Einsatzgruppen were the particular concern of the Soviet Prosecutor Rudenko at the Nuremberg Trials. The 1947 indictment of the four groups alleged that in the course of their operations they had killed not less than one million Jews in Russia merely because they were Jews. These allegations have since been elaborated; it is now claimed that the murder of Soviet Jews by the Einsatzgruppen constituted Phase One in the plan to exterminate the Jews, Phase Two being the transportation of European Jews to Poland. Reitlinger admits that the original term "final solution" referred to emigration and had nothing to do with the liquidation of Jews, but he then claims that an extermination policy began at the time of the invasion of Russia in 1941. He considers Hitler's order of July 1941 for the liquidation of the Communist commissars, and he concludes that this was accompanied by a verbal order from Hitler for the Einsatzgruppen to liquidate all Soviet Jews (*Die Endlösung*, p. 91). If this assumption is based on anything at all, it is probably the worthless Wisliceny statement, which alleges that the Einsatzgruppen were soon receiving orders to extend their task of crushing Communists and partisans to a "general massacre" of Russian Jews. It is very significant that, once again, it is a "verbal order" for exterminating Jews that is supposed to have accompanied Hitler's genuine, written order — yet another nebulous and unprovable assumption on the part of Reitlinger. An earlier order from Hitler, dated March 1941 and signed by Field Marshal Keitel, makes it quite clear what the real tasks of the future Einsatzgruppen would be. It states that in the Russian campaign, the Reichsführer S.S. (Himmler) is to be entrusted with "tasks for the political administration, tasks which result from the struggle which has to be carried out between two opposing political systems" (Manvell and Frankl, *ibid.*, p. 115). This plainly refers to eliminating Communism, especially the political commissars whose specific task was Communist indoctrination.

## THE OHLENDORF TRIAL

The most revealing trial in the "Einsatzgruppen Case" at Nuremberg was that of S.S. General Otto Ohlendorf, the chief of the S.D. who commanded Einsatzgruppe D in the Ukraine, attached to Field Marshal von Manstein's Eleventh Army. During the last phase of the war he was employed as a foreign trade expert in the Ministry of Economics. Ohlendorf was one of those subjected to the torture described earlier, and in his affidavit of November 5th, 1945 he was "persuaded" to confess that 90,000 Jews had been killed under his command alone. Ohlendorf did not come to trial until 1948, long after

the main Nuremberg Trial, and by that time he was insisting that his earlier statement had been extracted from him under torture. In his main speech before the Tribunal, Ohlendorf took the opportunity to denounce Philip Auerbach, the Jewish attorney-general of the Bavarian State Office for Restitution, who at that time was claiming compensation for "eleven million Jews" who had suffered in German concentration camps. Ohlendorf dismissed this ridiculous claim, stating that "not the minutest part" of the people for whom Auerbach was demanding compensation had even seen a concentration camp. Ohlendorf lived long enough to see Auerbach convicted for embezzlement and fraud (forging documents purporting to show huge payments of compensation to non-existent people) before his own execution finally took place in 1951. Ohlendorf explained to the Tribunal that his units often had to prevent massacres of Jews organised by anti-Semitic Ukrainians behind the German front, and he denied that the Einsatzgruppen as a whole had inflicted even one quarter of the casualties claimed by the prosecution. He insisted that the illegal partisan warfare in Russia, which he had to combat, had taken a far higher toll of lives from the regular German army - an assertion confirmed by the Soviet Government, which boasted of 500,000 German troops killed by partisans. In fact, Franz Stahlecker, commander of Einsatzgruppe A in the Baltic region and White Russia, was himself killed by partisans in 1942. The English jurist F. J. P. Veale, in dealing with the Action Groups, explains that in the fighting on the Russian front no distinction could be properly drawn between partisans and the civilian population, because any Russian civilian who maintained his civilian status instead of acting as a terrorist was liable to be executed by his countrymen as a traitor. Veale says of the Action Groups: "There is no question that their orders were to combat terror by terror", and he finds it strange that atrocities committed by the partisans in the struggle were regarded as blameless simply because they turned out to be on the winning side (*ibid.* p. 223). Ohlendorf took the same view, and in a bitter appeal written before his execution, he accused the Allies of hypocrisy in holding the Germans to account by conventional laws of warfare while fighting a savage Soviet enemy who did not respect those laws.

## **ACTION GROUP EXECUTIONS DISTORTED**

The Soviet charge that the Action Groups had wantonly exterminated a million Jews during their operations has been shown subsequently to be a massive falsification. In fact, there had never been the slightest statistical basis for the figure. In this connection, Poliakov and Wulf cite the statement of Wilhelm Hoettl, the dubious American spy, double agent and former assistant of Eichmann. Hoettl, it will be remembered, claimed that Eichmann had "told him" that six million Jews had been exterminated — and he added that two million of these had been killed by the Einsatzgruppen. This absurd figure went beyond even the wildest estimates of Soviet Prosecutor Rudenko, and it was not given any credence by the American Tribunal which tried and condemned Ohlendorf. The real number of casualties for which the Action Groups were responsible has since been revealed in the scholarly work Manstein, his Campaigns and his Trial (London, 1951), by the able English lawyer R. T. Paget. Ohlendorf had been under Manstein's nominal command. Paget's conclusion is that the Nuremberg Court, in



accepting the figures of the Soviet prosecution, exaggerated the number of casualties by more than 1000 per cent and that they distorted even more the situations in which these casualties were inflicted. (These horrific distortions are the subject of six pages of William Shirer's *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, pp. 1140-46). Here, then, is the legendary 6 million in miniature; not one million deaths, but one hundred thousand. Of course, only a small proportion of these could have been Jewish partisans and Communist functionaries. It is worth repeating that these casualties were inflicted during savage partisan warfare on the Eastern front, and that Soviet terrorists claim to have killed five times that number of German troops. It has nevertheless remained a popular myth that the extermination of the Jews began with the actions of the Einsatzgruppen in Russia. In conclusion, we may briefly survey the Manstein trial itself, typical in so many ways of Nuremberg proceedings. Principally because Action Group D was attached to Manstein's command (though it was responsible solely to Himmler), the sixty-two year old, invalid Field Marshal, considered by most authorities to be the most brilliant German general of the war, was subjected to the shameful indignity of a "war-crimes" trial. Of the 17 charges, 15 were brought by the Communist Russian Government and two by the Communist Polish Government. Only one witness was called to give evidence at this trial, and he proved so unsatisfactory that the prosecution withdrew his evidence. Reliance was placed instead on 800 hearsay documents which were accepted by the court without any proof of their authenticity or authorship. The prosecution introduced written affidavits by Ohlendorf and other S.S. Leaders, but since these men were still alive, Manstein's defence lawyer Reginald Paget K.C. demanded their appearance in the witness-box. This was refused by the American authorities, and Paget declared that this refusal was due to fear lest the condemned men revealed what methods had been used to induce them to sign their affidavits. Manstein was eventually acquitted on eight of the charges, including the two Polish ones which, as Paget said, "were so flagrantly bogus that one was left wondering why they had been presented at all."

## **THE OSWALD POHL TRIAL**

The case of the Action Groups is a revealing insight into the methods of the Nuremberg Trials and the fabrication of the Myth of the Six Million. Another is the trial of Oswald Pohl in 1948, which is of great importance as it bears directly on the administration of the concentration camp system. Pohl had been the chief disbursing officer of the German Navy until 1934, when Himmler requested his transfer to the S.S. For eleven years he was the principal administrative chief of the entire S.S. in his position as head of the S.S. Economy and Administration Office, which after 1941 was concerned with the industrial productivity of the concentration camp system. A peak point of hypocrisy was reached at the trial when the prosecution said to Pohl that "had Germany rested content with the exclusion of Jews from her own territory, with denying them German citizenship, with excluding them from public office, or any like domestic regulation, no other nation could have been heard to complain." The truth is that Germany was bombarded with insults and economic sanctions for doing precisely these things, and her internal measures against the Jews were certainly a major cause of the declaration

of war against Germany by the democracies. Oswald Pohl was an extremely sensitive and intellectual individual who was reduced to a broken man in the course of his trial. As Senator McCarthy pointed out, Pohl had signed some incriminating statements after being subjected to severe torture, including a bogus admission that he had seen a gas chamber at Auschwitz in the summer of 1944. The prosecution strenuously pressed this charge, but Pohl successfully repudiated it. The aim of the prosecution was to depict this dejected man as a veritable fiend in human shape, an impression hopelessly at variance with the testimony of those who knew him. Such testimony was given by Heinrich Hoepker, an anti-Nazi friend of Pohl's wife who came into frequent contact with him during the period 1942-45. Hoepker noted that Pohl was essentially a serene and mild-mannered person. During a visit to Pohl in the spring of 1944, Hoepker was brought into contact with concentration camp inmates who were working on a local project outside the camp area. He noted that the prisoners worked in a leisurely manner and relaxed atmosphere without any pressure from their guards. Hoepker declared that Pohl did not hold an emotional attitude to the Jews, and did not object to his wife entertaining her Jewish friend Annemarie Jacques at their home. By the beginning of 1945, Hoepker was fully convinced that the administrator of the concentration camps was a humane, conscientious and dedicated servant of his task, and he was astonished when he heard later in 1945 of the accusations being made against Pohl and his colleagues. Frau Pohl noted that her husband retained his serenity in the face of adversity until March 1945, when he visited the camp at Bergen-Belsen at the time of the typhus epidemic there. Hitherto the camp had been a model of cleanliness and order, but the chaotic conditions at the close of the war had reduced it to a state of extreme hardship. Pohl, who was unable to alleviate conditions there because of the desperate pass which the war had reached by that time, was deeply affected by the experience and, according to his wife, never regained his former state of composure. Dr. Alfred Seidl, the highly respected lawyer who acted as principal defence counsel at the Nuremberg Trials, went to work passionately to secure the acquittal of Pohl. Seidl had been a personal friend of the accused for many years, and was thoroughly convinced of his innocence with respect to the fraudulent charge of planned genocide against the Jews. The Allied judgment which condemned Pohl did not prompt Seidl to change his opinion in the slightest. He declared that the prosecution had failed to produce a single piece of valid evidence against him. One of the most eloquent defences of Oswald Pohl was made by S.S. Lieutenant Colonel Kurt Schmidt-Klevenow, a legal officer in the S.S. Economy and Administration Office, in his affidavit of August 8th, 1947. This affidavit has been deliberately omitted from the published documents known as Trials of the War Criminals before the Nuremberg Military Tribunals 1946 - 1949. Schmidt-Klevenow pointed out that Pohl had given his fullest support to Judge Konrad Morgen of the Reich Criminal Police Office, whose job was to investigate irregularities at the concentration camps. Later on we shall refer to a case in which Pohl was in favour of the death penalty for camp commandant Koch, who was accused by an S.S. court of misconduct. Schmidt-Klevenow explained that Pohl was instrumental in arranging for local police chiefs to share in the jurisdiction of concentration camps, and took personal initiative in securing strict discipline on the part of camp personnel. In short, the evidence given at the Pohl trial shows that the proceedings involved nothing less than the deliberate defamation of a man's character in order to support the

propaganda legend of genocide against the Jews in the concentration camps he administered.

## **FALSIFIED EVIDENCE AND FRAUDULENT AFFIDAVITS**

Spurious testimony at Nuremberg which included extravagant statements in support of the myth of the Six Million was invariably given by former German officers because of pressure, either severe torture as in the cases cited previously, or the assurance of leniency for themselves if they supplied the required statements. An example of the latter was the testimony of S.S. General Erich von dem Bach-Zelewski. He was threatened with execution himself because of his suppression of the revolt by Polish partisans at Warsaw in August 1944, which he carried out with his S.S. brigade of White Russians. He was therefore prepared to be "co-operative". The evidence of Bach-Zelewski constituted the basis of the testimony against the Reichsführer of the S.S. Heinrich Himmler at the main Nuremberg Trial (Trial of the Major War Criminals, Vol. IV, pp, 29, 36). In March 1941, on the eve of the invasion of Russia, Himmler invited the Higher S.S. Leaders to his Castle at Wewelsburg for a conference, including Bach-Zelewski who was an expert on partisan warfare. In his Nuremberg evidence, he depicted Himmler speaking in grandiose terms at this conference about the liquidation of peoples in Eastern Europe, but Göring, in the courtroom, denounced Bach-Zelewski to his face for the falsity of this testimony. An especially outrageous allegation concerned a supposed declaration by Himmler that one of the aims of the Russian campaign was to "decimate the Slav population by thirty millions." What Himmler really said is given by his Chief of Staff, Wolff — that war in Russia was certain to result in millions of dead (Manvell and Frankl, *ibid.* p. 117). Another brazen falsehood was Bach-Zelewski's accusation that on August 31st, 1942 Himmler personally witnessed the execution of one hundred Jews by an Einsatz detachment at Minsk, causing him to nearly faint. It is known, however, that on this date Himmler was in conference at his field headquarters at Zhitomir in the Ukraine (cf K. Vowinckel, *Die Wehrmacht im Kampf*, vol. 4, p. 275). Much is made of Bach-Zelewski's evidence in all the books on Himmler, especially Willi Frischauer's *Himmler: Evil Genius of the Third Reich* (London, 1953, p. 148 ff). However, in April 1959, Bach-Zelewski publicly repudiated his Nuremberg testimony before a West German court. He admitted that his earlier statements had not the slightest foundation in fact, and that he had made them for the sake of expediency and his own survival. The German court, after careful deliberation, accepted his retraction. Needless to say, what Veale calls the "Iron Curtain of Discreet Silence" descended immediately over these events. They have had no influence whatever on the books which propagate the myth of the Six Million, and Bach-Zelewski's testimony on Himmler is still taken at its face value. The truth concerning Himmler is provided ironically by an anti-Nazi — Felix Kersten, his physician and masseur. Because Kersten was opposed to the regime, he tends to support the legend that the internment of Jews meant their extermination. But from his close personal knowledge of Himmler he cannot help but tell the truth concerning him, and in his *Memoirs 1940-1945* (London, 1956, p. 119 ff) he is emphatic in stating that Heinrich Himmler did not advocate liquidating the Jews but favoured their emigration overseas.

Neither does Kersten implicate Hitler. However, the credibility of his anti-Nazi narrative is completely shattered when, in search of an alternative villain, he declares that Dr. Goebbels was the real advocate of "extermination". This nonsensical allegation is amply disproved by the fact that Goebbels was still concerned with the Madagascar project even after it had been temporarily shelved by the German Foreign Office, as we showed earlier. So much for false evidence at Nuremberg. Reference has also been made to the thousands of fraudulent "written affidavits" which were accepted by the Nuremberg Court without any attempt to ascertain the authenticity of their contents or even their authorship. These hearsay documents, often of the most bizarre kind, were introduced as "evidence" so long as they bore the required signature. A typical prosecution affidavit contested by the defence in the Concentration Camp Trial of 1947 was that of Alois Hoellriegel, a member of the camp personnel at Mauthausen in Austria. This affidavit, which the defence proved was fabricated during Hoellriegel's torture, had already been used to secure the conviction of S.S. General Ernst Kaltenbrunner in 1946. It claimed that a mass gassing operation had taken place at Mauthausen and that Hoellriegel had witnessed Kaltenbrunner (the highest S.S. Leader in the Reich excepting Himmler) actually taking part in it. By the time of the Concentration Camp Trial (Pohl's trial) a year later, it had become impossible to sustain this piece of nonsense when it was produced in court again. The defence not only demonstrated that the affidavit was falsified, but showed that all deaths at Mauthausen were systematically checked by the local police authorities. They were also entered on a camp register, and particular embarrassment was caused to the prosecution when the Mauthausen register, one of the few that survived, was produced in evidence. The defence also obtained numerous affidavits from former inmates of Mauthausen (a prison camp chiefly for criminals) testifying to humane and orderly conditions there.

## **ALLIED ACCUSATIONS DISBELIEVED**

There is no more eloquent testimony to the tragedy and tyranny of Nuremberg than the pathetic astonishment or outraged disbelief of the accused persons themselves at the grotesque charges made against them. Such is reflected in the affidavit of S.S. Major-General Heinz Fanslau, who visited most of the German concentration camps during the last years of the war. Although a front line soldier of the Waffen S.S., Fanslau had taken a great interest in concentration camp conditions, and he was selected as a prime target by the Allies for the charge of conspiracy to annihilate the Jews. It was argued, on the basis of his many contacts, that he must have been fully involved. When it was first rumoured that he would be tried and convicted, hundreds of affidavits were produced on his behalf by camp inmates he had visited. When he read the full scope of the indictment against the concentration camp personnel in supplementary Nuremberg Trial No. 4 on May 6th, 1947, Fanslau declared in disbelief: "This cannot be possible, because I, too, would have had to know something about it." It should be emphasised that throughout the Nuremberg proceedings, the German leaders on trial never believed for a moment the allegations of the Allied prosecution. Hermann Göring, who was exposed to the full brunt of the Nuremberg atrocity propaganda, failed to be convinced by it. Hans Fritzsche, on trial as the highest functionary of Goebbels' Ministry, relates

that Göring, even after hearing the Ohlendorf affidavit on the Einsatzgruppen and the Höss testimony on Auschwitz, remained convinced that the extermination of Jews was entirely propaganda fiction (*The Sword in the Scales*, London, 1953, p. 145). At one point during the trial, Göring declared rather cogently that the first time he had heard of it "was right here in Nuremberg" (Shirer, *ibid.* p. 1147). The Jewish writers Poliakov, Reitlinger and Manvell and Frankl all attempt to implicate Göring in this supposed extermination, but Charles Bewley in his work *Hermann Göring* (Goettingen, 1956) shows that not the slightest evidence was found at Nuremberg to substantiate this charge. Hans Fritzsche pondered on the whole question during the trials, and he concluded that there had certainly been no thorough investigation of these monstrous charges. Fritzsche, who was acquitted, was an associate of Goebbels and a skilled propagandist. He recognised that the alleged massacre of the Jews was the main point of the indictment against all defendants. Kaltenbrunner, who succeeded Heydrich as chief of the Reich Security Head Office and was the main defendant for the S.S. due to the death of Himmler, was no more convinced of the genocide charges than was Göring. He confided to Fritzsche that the prosecution was scoring apparent successes because of their technique of coercing witnesses and suppressing evidence, which was precisely the accusation of Judges Wenersturm and van Roden.

## **6. AUSCHWITZ AND POLISH JEWRY**

The concentration camp at Auschwitz near Cracow in Poland has remained at the centre of the alleged extermination of millions of Jews. Later we shall see how, when it was discovered by honest observers in the British and American zones after the war that no "gas chambers" existed in the German camps such as Dachau and Bergen-Belsen, attention was shifted to the eastern camps, particularly Auschwitz. Ovens definitely existed here, it was claimed. Unfortunately, the eastern camps were in the Russian zone of occupation, so that no one could verify whether these allegations were true or not. The Russians refused to allow anyone to see Auschwitz until about ten years after the war, by which time they were able to alter its appearance and give some plausibility to the claim that millions of people had been exterminated there. If anyone doubts that the Russians are capable of such deception, they should remember the monuments erected at sites where thousands of people were murdered in Russia by Stalin's secret police — but where the monuments proclaim them to be victims of German troops in World War Two. The truth about Auschwitz is that it was the largest and most important industrial concentration camp, producing all kinds of material for the war industry. The camp consisted of synthetic coal and rubber plants built by I. G. Farben Industrie, for whom the prisoners supplied labour. Auschwitz also comprised an agricultural research station, with laboratories, plant nurseries and facilities for stock breeding, as well as Krupps armament works. We have already remarked that this kind of activity was the prime function of the camps; all major firms had subsidiaries in them and the S.S. even opened their own factories. Accounts of visits by Himmler to the camps show that his main purpose was to inspect and assess their industrial efficiency. When he visited Auschwitz in March 1941 accompanied by high executives of I.G. Farben, he showed no interest in the problems of the camp as a facility for prisoners,

but merely ordered that the camp be enlarged to take 100,000 detainees to supply labour for I.G. Farben. This hardly accords with a policy of exterminating prisoners by the million.

## **MORE AND MORE MILLIONS**

It was nevertheless at this single camp that about half of the six million Jews were supposed to have been exterminated, indeed, some writers claim 4 or even 5 million. Four million was the sensational figure announced by the Soviet Government after the Communists had "investigated" the camp, at the same time as they were attempting to blame the Katyn massacre on the Germans. Reitlinger admits that information regarding Auschwitz and other eastern camps comes from the post-war Communist regimes of Eastern Europe: "The evidence concerning the Polish death camps was mainly taken after the war by Polish State commissions or by the Central Jewish Historical Commission of Poland" (The Final Solution, p. 631). However, no living, authentic eye-witness of these "gassings" has ever been produced and validated. Benedikt Kautsky, who spent seven years in concentration camps, including three in Auschwitz, alleged in his book *Teufel und Verdammte* (Devil and Damned, Zurich, 1946) that "not less than 3,500,000 Jews" had been killed there. This was certainly a remarkable statement, because by his own admission he had never seen a gas chamber. He confessed: "I was in the big German concentration camps. However, I must establish the truth that in no camp at any time did I come across such an installation as a gas chamber" (p. 272-3). The only execution he actually witnessed was when two Polish inmates were executed for killing two Jewish inmates. Kautsky, who was sent from Buchenwald in October, 1942 to work at Auschwitz-Buna, stresses in his book that the use of prisoners in war industry was a major feature of concentration camp policy until the end of the war. He fails to reconcile this with an alleged policy of massacring Jews. The exterminations at Auschwitz are alleged to have occurred between March 1942 and October 1944; the figure of half of six million, therefore, would mean the extermination and disposal of about 94,000 people per month for thirty two months - approximately 3,350 people every day, day and night, for over two and a half years. This kind of thing is so ludicrous that it scarcely needs refuting. And yet Reitlinger claims quite seriously that Auschwitz could dispose of no less than 6,000 people a day. Although Reitlinger's 6,000 a day would mean a total by October 1944 of over 5 million, all such estimates pale before the wild fantasies of Olga Lengyel in her book *Five Chimneys* (London, 1959). Claiming to be a former inmate of Auschwitz, she asserts that the camp cremated no less than "720 per hour, or 17,280 corpses per twenty-four hour shift." She also alleges that, in addition, 8,000 people were burned every day in the "death-pits", and that therefore "In round numbers, about 24,000 corpses were handled every day" (p. 80-1). This, of course, would mean a yearly rate of over 8½ million. Thus between March 1942 and October 1944 Auschwitz would finally have disposed of over 21 million people, six million more than the entire world Jewish population. Comment is superfluous. Although several millions, were supposed to have died at Auschwitz alone, Reitlinger has to admit that only 363,000 inmates were registered at the camp for the whole of the period between January 1940 and February 1945 (The S.S. Alibi of a Nation, p. 268 ff), and by

no means all of them were Jews. It is frequently claimed that many prisoners were never registered, but no one has offered any proof of this. Even if there were as many unregistered as there were registered, it would mean only a total of 750,000 prisoners — hardly enough for the elimination of 3 or 4 million. Moreover, large numbers of the camp population were released or transported elsewhere during the war, and at the end 80,000 were evacuated westward in January 1945 before the Russian advance. One example will suffice of the statistical frauds relating to casualties at Auschwitz. Shirer claims that in the summer of 1944, no less than 300,000 Hungarian Jews were done to death in a mere forty-six days (ibid. p. 1156). This would have been almost the entire Hungarian Jewish population, which numbered some 380,000. But according to the Central Statistical Office of Budapest, there were 260,000 Jews in Hungary in 1945 (which roughly conforms with the Joint Distribution Committee figure of 220,000), so that only 120,000 were classed as no longer resident. Of these, 35,000 were emigrants from the new Communist regime, and a further 25,000 were still being held in Russia after having worked in German labour battalions there. This leaves only 60,000 Hungarian Jews unaccounted for, but M. E. Namenyi estimates that 60,000 Jews returned to Hungary from deportation in Germany, though Reitlinger says this figure is too high (The Final Solution, p. 497). Possibly it is, but bearing in mind the substantial emigration of Hungarian Jews during the war (cf Report of the ICRC, Vol. I, p. 649), the number of Hungarian Jewish casualties must have been very low indeed.

## **AUSCHWITZ: AN EYE-WITNESS ACCOUNT**

Some new facts about Auschwitz are at last beginning to make a tentative appearance. They are contained in a recent work called *Die Auschwitz-Lüge: Ein Erlebnisbericht von Thies Christopherson* (The Auschwitz Legends: An Account of his Experiences by Thies Christopherson, Kritik Verlag/Mohrkirch, 1973). Published by the German lawyer Dr. Manfred Roeder in the periodical *Deutsche Bürger-Initiative*, it is an eye-witness account of Auschwitz by Thies Christopherson, who was sent to the Buna-works plant laboratories at Auschwitz to research into the production of synthetic rubber for the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute. In May 1973, not long after the appearance of this account, the veteran Jewish "Nazi-hunter" Simon Wiesenthal wrote to the Frankfurt Chamber of Lawyers, demanding that the publisher and author of the *Forward*, Dr. Roeder, a member of the Chamber, should be brought before its disciplinary commission. Sure enough, proceedings began in July, but not without harsh criticism even from the Press, who asked "Is Simon Wiesenthal the new Gauleiter of Germany?" (*Deutsche Wochenzeitung*, July 27th, 1973). Christopherson's account is certainly one of the most important documents for a re-appraisal of Auschwitz. He spent the whole of 1944 there, during which time he visited all of the separate camps comprising the large Auschwitz complex, including Auschwitz-Birkenau where it is alleged that wholesale massacres of Jews took place. Christopherson, however, is in no doubt that this is totally untrue. He writes: "I was in Auschwitz from January 1944 until December 1944. After the war I heard about the mass murders which were supposedly perpetrated by the S.S. against the Jewish prisoners, and I was perfectly astonished. Despite all the evidence of witnesses, all the newspaper reports and radio broadcasts I still do not believe today in

these horrible deeds. I have said this many times and in many places, but to no purpose. One is never believed" (p. 16). Space forbids a detailed summary here of the author's experiences at Auschwitz, which include facts about camp routine and the daily life of prisoners totally at variance with the allegations of propaganda (pp. 22-7). More important are his revelations about the supposed existence of an extermination camp. "During the whole of my time at Auschwitz, I never observed the slightest evidence of mass gassings. Moreover, the odour of burning flesh that is often said to have hung over the camp is a downright falsehood. In the vicinity of the main camp (Auschwitz I) was a large farrier's works, from which the smell of molten iron was naturally not pleasant" (p. 33-4). Reitlinger confirms that there were five blast furnaces and five collieries at Auschwitz, which together with the Buna works factories comprised Auschwitz III (ibid. p. 452). The author agrees that a crematorium would certainly have existed at Auschwitz, "since 200,000 people lived there, and in every city with 200,000 inhabitants there would be a crematorium. Naturally people died there — but not only prisoners. In fact the wife of Obersturmbannführer A. (Christopherson's superior) also died there" (p. 33). The author explains: "There were no secrets at Auschwitz. In September 1944 a commission of the International Red Cross came to the camp for an inspection. They were particularly interested in the camp at Birkenau, though we also had many inspections at Raisko" (Buna works section, p. 35). Christopherson points out that the constant visits to Auschwitz by outsiders cannot be reconciled with allegations of mass extermination. When describing the visit of his wife to the camp in May, he observes: "The fact that it was possible to receive visits from our relatives at any time demonstrates the openness of the camp administration. Had Auschwitz been a great extermination camp, we would certainly not have been able to receive such visits" (p. 27). After the war, Christopherson came to hear of the alleged existence of a building with gigantic chimneys in the vicinity of the main camp. "This was supposed to be the crematorium. However, I must record the fact that when I left the camp at Auschwitz in December 1944, I had not seen this building there" (p. 37). Does this mysterious building exist today? Apparently not; Reitlinger claims it was demolished and "completely burnt out in full view of the camp" in October, though Christopherson never saw this public demolition. Although it is said to have taken place "in full view of the camp", it was allegedly seen by only one Jewish witness, a certain Dr. Bendel, and his is the only testimony to the occurrence (Reitlinger, ibid, p. 457). This situation is generally typical. When it comes down to hard evidence, it is strangely elusive; the building was "demolished", the document is "lost", the order was "verbal". At Auschwitz today, visitors are shown a small furnace and here they are told that millions of people were exterminated. The Soviet State Commission which "investigated" the camp announced on May 12th, 1945, that "Using rectified coefficients ... the technical expert commission has ascertained that during the time that the Auschwitz camp existed, the German butchers exterminated in this camp not less than four million citizens ...". Reitlinger's surprisingly frank comment on this is perfectly adequate: "The world has grown mistrustful of 'rectified coefficients' and the figure of four millions has become ridiculous" (ibid, p. 460). Finally, the account of Mr. Christopherson draws attention to a very curious circumstance. The only defendant who did not appear at the Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial in 1963 was Richard Baer, the successor of Rudolf Höss as commandant of Auschwitz. Though in perfect health, he died suddenly in prison before



the trial had begun, "in a highly mysterious way" according to the newspaper; *Deutsche Wochenzeitung* (July 27th, 1973). Baer's sudden demise before giving evidence is especially strange, since the Paris newspaper *Rivarol* recorded his insistence that "during the whole time in which he governed Auschwitz, he never saw any gas chambers nor believed that such things existed," and from this statement nothing would dissuade him. In short, the Christopherson account adds to a mounting collection of evidence demonstrating that the giant industrial complex of Auschwitz (comprising thirty separate installations and divided by the main Vienna-Cracow railway line) was nothing but a vast war production centre, which, while admittedly employing the compulsory labour of detainees, was certainly not a place of "mass extermination".

## **THE WARSAW GHETTO**

In terms of numbers, Polish Jewry is supposed to have suffered most of all from extermination, not only at Auschwitz, but at an endless list of newly-discovered "death camps" such as Treblinka, Sobibor, Belzec, Majdanek, Chelmno and at many more obscure places which seem suddenly to have gained prominence. At the centre of the alleged extermination of the Polish Jews is the dramatic uprising in April 1943 of the Warsaw Ghetto. This is often represented as a revolt against being deported to gas ovens; presumably the alleged subject of Hitler and Himmler's "secret discussions" had leaked out and gained wide publicity in Warsaw. The case of the Warsaw Ghetto is an instructive insight into the creation of the extermination legend itself. Indeed, its evacuation by the Germans in 1943 is often referred to as the "extermination of the Polish Jews" although it was nothing of the kind, and layers of mythology have tended to surround it after the publication of sensational novels like John Hersey's *The Wall* and Leon Uris' *Exodus*. When the Germans first occupied Poland, they confined the Jews, not in detention camps but in ghettos for reasons of security. The interior administration of the ghettos was in the hands of Jewish Councils elected by themselves, and they were policed by an independent Jewish police force. Special currency notes were introduced into the ghettos to prevent speculation. Whether this system was right or wrong, it was understandable in time of war, and although the ghetto is perhaps an unpleasant social establishment, it is by no means barbaric. And it is certainly not an organisation for the destruction of a race. But, of course, it is frequently said that this is what the ghettos were really for. A recent publication on the Warsaw Ghetto made the brazen assertion that concentration camps "were a substitute for the practice of cramming the Jews into overcrowded ghettos and starving them to death." It seems that whatever security system the Germans used, and to whatever lengths they went to preserve a semblance of community for the Jews, they can never escape the charge of "extermination". It has been established already that the 1931 Jewish population census for Poland placed the number of Jews at 2,732,600, and that after emigration and flight to the Soviet Union, no more than 1,100,000 were under German control. These incontrovertible facts, however, do not prevent Manvell and Frankl asserting that "there had been over three million Jews in Poland when Germany began the invasion" and that in 1942 "some two million still awaited death" (*ibid*, p. 140). In reality, of the million or so Jews in Poland, almost half, about 400,000 were eventually concentrated in the

ghetto of Warsaw, an area of about two and a half square miles around the old mediaeval ghetto. The remainder had already been moved to the Polish Government-General by September 1940. In the summer of 1942, Himmler ordered the resettlement of all Polish Jews in detention camps in order to obtain their labour, part of the system of general concentration for labour assignment in the Government-General. Thus between July and October 1942, over three quarters of the Warsaw Ghetto's inhabitants were peacefully evacuated and transported, supervised by the Jewish police themselves. As we have seen, transportation to camps is alleged to have ended in "extermination," but there is absolutely no doubt from the evidence available that it involved only the effective procurement of labour and the prevention of unrest. In the first place, Himmler discovered on a surprise visit to Warsaw in January 1943 that 24,000 Jews registered as armaments workers were in fact working illegally as tailors and furriers (Manvell and Frankl, *ibid*, p. 140); the Ghetto was also being used as a base for subversive forays into the main area of Warsaw. After six months of peaceful evacuation, when only about 60,000 Jews remained in the residential ghetto, the Germans met with an armed rebellion on 18th January, 1943. Manvell and Frankl admit that "The Jews involved in planned resistance had for a long time been engaged in smuggling arms from the outside world, and combat groups fired on and killed S.S. men and militia in charge of a column of deportees." The terrorists in the Ghetto uprising were also assisted by the Polish Home Army and the PPR — Polska Partia Robotnicza, the Communist Polish Workers Party. It was under these circumstances of a revolt aided by partisans and communists that the occupying forces, as any army would in a similar situation, moved in to suppress the terrorists, if necessary by destroying the residential area itself. It should be remembered that the whole process of evacuation would have continued peacefully had not extremists among the inhabitants planned an armed rebellion which in the end was bound to fail. When S.S. Lieutenant-General Stroop entered the Ghetto with armoured cars on 19th April, he immediately came under fire and lost twelve men; German and Polish casualties in the battle, which lasted four weeks, totalled 101 men killed and wounded. Stubborn resistance by the Jewish Combat Organisation in the face of impossible odds led to an estimated 12,000 Jewish casualties, the majority by remaining in burning buildings and dug-outs. A total, however, of 56,065 inhabitants were captured and peacefully resettled in the area of the Government-General. Many Jews within the Ghetto had resented the terror imposed on them by the Combat Organisation, and had attempted to inform on their headquarters to the German authorities.

## **SUDDEN SURVIVORS**

The circumstances surrounding the Warsaw Ghetto revolt, as well as the deportations to eastern labour camps such as Auschwitz, has led to the most colourful tales concerning the fate of Polish Jews, the largest bloc of Jewry in Europe. The Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, in figures prepared by them for the Nuremberg Trials, stated that in 1945 there were only 80,000 Jews remaining in Poland. They also alleged that there were no Polish-Jewish displaced persons left in Germany or Austria, a claim that was at some variance with the number of Polish Jews arrested by the British and

Americans for black market activities. However, the new Communist regime in Poland was unable to prevent a major anti-Jewish pogrom at Kielce on July 4th, 1946 and more than 150,000 Polish Jews suddenly fled into Western Germany. Their appearance was somewhat embarrassing, and their emigration to Palestine and the United States was carried out in record time. Subsequently, the number of Polish Jewish survivors underwent considerable revision; in the American-Jewish Year Book 1948-1949 it was placed at 390,000 quite an advance on the original 80,000. We may expect further revisions upwards in the future.

## **SOME CONCENTRATION CAMP MEMOIRS**

The most influential agency in the propagation of the extermination legend has been the paper-back book and magazine industry, and it is through their sensational publications, produced for commercial gain, that the average person is made acquainted with a myth of an entirely political character and purpose. The hey-day of these hate-Germany books was in the 1950's, when virulent Germanophobia found a ready market, but the industry continues to flourish and is experiencing another boom today. The industry's products consist generally of so-called "memoirs", and these fall into two basic categories: those which are supposedly by former S.S. men, camp commandants and the like, and those bloodcurdling reminiscences allegedly by former concentration camp inmates.

## **COMMUNIST ORIGINS**

Of the first kind, the most outstanding example is Commandant of Auschwitz by Rudolf Höss (London, 1960), which was originally published in the Polish language as *Wspomnienia* by the Communist Government. Höss, a young man who took over at Auschwitz in 1940, was first arrested by the British and detained at Flensburg, but he was soon handed over to the Polish Communist authorities who condemned him to death in 1947 and executed him almost immediately. The so-called Höss memoirs are undoubtedly a forgery produced under Communist auspices, as we shall demonstrate, though the Communists themselves claim that Höss was "ordered to write the story of his life" and a hand-written original supposedly exists, but no one has ever seen it. Höss was subjected to torture and brain-washing techniques by the Communists during the period of his arrest, and his testimony at Nuremberg was delivered in a mindless monotone as he stared blankly into space. Even Reitlinger rejects this testimony as hopelessly untrustworthy. It is indeed remarkable how much of the "evidence" regarding the Six Million stems from Communist sources; this includes the major documents such as the Wisliceny statement and the Höss "memoirs", which are undoubtedly the two most quoted items in extermination literature, as well as all the information on the so-called "death camps" such as Auschwitz. This information comes from the Jewish Historical Commission of Poland; the Central Commission for the Investigation of War Crimes, Warsaw; and the Russian State War Crimes Commission, Moscow. Reitlinger acknowledges that the Höss testimony at Nuremberg was a catalogue of wild

exaggerations, such as that Auschwitz was disposing of 16,000 people a day, which would mean a total at the end of the war of over 13 million. Instead of exposing such estimates for the Soviet-inspired frauds they obviously are, Reitlinger and others prefer to think that such ridiculous exaggerations were due to "pride" in doing a professional job. Ironically, this is completely irreconcilable with the supposedly authentic Höss memoirs, which make a clever attempt at plausibility by suggesting the opposite picture of distaste for the job. Höss is supposed to have "confessed" to a total of 3 million people exterminated at Auschwitz, though at his own trial in Warsaw the prosecution reduced the number to 1,135,000. However, we have already noted that the Soviet Government announced an official figure of 4 million after their "investigation" of the camp in 1945. This kind of casual juggling with millions of people does not appear to worry the writers of extermination literature. A review of the Höss "memoirs" in all their horrid detail would be tedious. We may confine ourselves to those aspects of the extermination legend which are designed with the obvious purpose of forestalling any proof of its falsity. Such, for example, is the manner in which the alleged extermination of Jews is described. This was supposed to have been carried out by a "special detachment" of Jewish prisoners. They took charge of the newly arrived contingents at the camp, led them into the enormous "gas-chambers" and disposed of the bodies afterwards. The S.S., therefore, did very little, so that most of the S.S. personnel at the camp could be left in complete ignorance of the "extermination programme". Of course, no Jew would ever be found who claimed to have been a member of this gruesome "special detachment", so that the whole issue is left conveniently unprovable. It is worth repeating that no living, authentic eye-witness to these events has ever been produced. Conclusive evidence that the Höss memoirs are a forgery lies in an incredible slip by the Communist editors. Höss is supposed to say that the Jehovah's Witnesses at Auschwitz approved of murdering the Jews because the Jews were the enemies of Christ. It is well known that in Soviet Russia today and in all her satellite countries of eastern Europe, the Communists conduct a bitter campaign of suppression against the Jehovah's Witnesses whom they regard as the religious sect most dangerous to Communist beliefs. That this sect is deliberately and grossly defamed in the Höss memoirs proves the document's Communist origins beyond any doubt.

## **INCRIMINATING REMINISCENCES**

Certainly the most bogus "memoirs" yet published are those of Adolf Eichmann. Before his illegal kidnapping by the Israelis in May, 1960 and the attendant blaze of international publicity, few people had ever heard of him. He was indeed a relatively unimportant person, the head of Office A4b in Department IV (the Gestapo) of the Reich Security Head Office. His office supervised the transportation to detention camps of a particular section of enemy aliens, the Jews. A positive flood of unadulterated rubbish about Eichmann showered the world in 1960, of which we may cite as an example Comer Clarke's *Eichmann: The Savage Truth*. ("The orgies often went on until six in the morning, a few hours before consigning the next batch of victims to death," says Clarke in his chapter "Streamlined Death and Wild Sex Orgies," p. 124). Strangely enough, the alleged "memoirs" of Adolf Eichmann suddenly appeared at the time of his abduction to

Israel. They were uncritically published by the American Life magazine (November 28th, December 5th, 1960), and were supposed to have been given by Eichmann to a journalist in the Argentine shortly before his capture — an amazing coincidence. Other sources, however, gave an entirely different account of their origin, claiming that they were a record based on Eichmann's comments to an "associate" in 1955, though no one even bothered to identify this person. By an equally extraordinary coincidence, war crimes investigators claimed shortly afterwards to have just "found" in the archives of the U.S. Library of Congress, more than fifteen years after the war, the "complete file" of Eichmann's department. So far as the "memoirs" themselves are concerned, they were made to be as horribly incriminating as possible without straying too far into the realms of the purest fantasy, and depict Eichmann speaking with enormous relish about "the physical annihilation of the Jews." Their fraudulence is also attested to by various factual errors, such as that Himmler was already in command of the Reserve Army by April of 1944, instead of after the July plot against Hitler's life, a fact which Eichmann would certainly have known. The appearance of these "memoirs" at precisely the right moment raises no doubt that their object was to present a pre-trial propaganda picture of the archetypal "unregenerate Nazi" and fiend in human shape. The circumstances of the Eichmann trial in Israel do not concern us here; the documents of Soviet origin which were used in evidence, such as the Wisliceny statement, have been examined already, and for an account of the third-degree methods used on Eichmann during his captivity to render him "co-operative" the reader is referred to the London Jewish Chronicle, September 2nd, 1960. More relevant to the literature of the extermination legend are the contents of a letter which Eichmann is supposed to have written voluntarily and handed over to his captors in Buenos Aires. It need hardly be added that its Israeli authorship is transparently obvious. Nothing in it stretches human credulity further than the phrase "I am submitting this declaration of my own free will"; but the most hollow and revealing statement of all is his alleged willingness to appear before a court in Israel, "so that a true picture may be transmitted to future generations."

## **TREBLINKA FABRICATIONS**

The latest reminiscences to appear in print are those of Franz Stangl, the former commandant of the camp at Treblinka in Poland who was sentenced to life imprisonment in December 1970. These were published in an article by the London Daily Telegraph Magazine, October 8th, 1971, and were supposed to derive from a series of interviews with Stangl in prison. He died a few days after the interviews were concluded. These alleged reminiscences are certainly the goriest and most bizarre yet published, though one is grateful for a few admissions by the writer of the article, such as that "the evidence presented in the course of his trial did not prove Stangl himself to have committed specific acts of murder" and that the account of Stangl's beginnings in Poland "was in part fabrication." A typical example of this fabrication was the description of Stangl's first visit to Treblinka. As he drew into the railway station there, he is supposed to have seen "thousands of bodies" just strewn around next to the tracks, "hundreds, no, thousands of bodies everywhere, putrefying, decomposing." And "in the station was a train full of Jews, some dead, some still alive ... it looked as if it had been

there for days." The account reaches the heights of absurdity when Stangl is alleged to have got out of his car and "stepped kneedeep into money: I didn't know which way to turn, which way to go. I waded in papernotes, currency, precious stones, jewellery and clothes. They were everywhere, strewn all over the square." The scene is completed by "whores from Warsaw weaving drunk, dancing, singing, playing music", who were on the other side of the barbed wire fences. To literally believe this account of sinking "kneedeep" in Jewish bank-notes and precious stones amid thousands of putrefying corpses and lurching, singing prostitutes would require the most phenomenal degree of gullibility, and in any circumstances other than the Six Million legend it would be dismissed as the most outrageous nonsense. The statement which certainly robs the Stangl memoirs of any vestige of authenticity is his alleged reply when asked why he thought the Jews were being exterminated: "They wanted the Jews' money," is the answer. "That racial business was just secondary." The series of interviews are supposed to have ended on a highly dubious note indeed. When asked whether he thought there had been "any conceivable sense in this horror," the former Nazi commandant supposedly replied with enthusiasm: "Yes, I am sure there was. Perhaps the Jews were meant to have this enormous jolt to pull them together; to create a people; to identify themselves with each other." One could scarcely imagine a more perfect answer had it been invented.

## **BEST-SELLER A HOAX**

Of the other variety of memoirs, those which present a picture of frail Jewry caught in the vice of Nazism, the most celebrated is undoubtedly *The Diary of Anne Frank*, and the truth concerning this book is only one appalling insight into the fabrication of a propaganda legend. First published in 1952, *The Diary of Anne Frank* became an immediate best-seller; since then it has been republished in paper-back, going through 40 impressions, and was made into a successful Hollywood film. In royalties alone, Otto Frank, the girl's father, has made a fortune from the sale of the book, which purports to represent the real-life tragedy of his daughter. With its direct appeal to the emotions, the book and the film have influenced literally millions of people, certainly more throughout the world than any other story of its kind. And yet only seven years after its initial publication, a New York Supreme Court case established that the book was a hoax. *The Diary of Anne Frank* has been sold to the public as the actual diary of a young Jewish girl from Amsterdam, which she wrote at the age of 12 while her family and four other Jews were hiding in the back room of a house during the German occupation. Eventually, they were arrested and detained in a concentration camp, where Anne Frank supposedly died when she was 14. When Otto Frank was liberated from the camp at the end of the war, he returned to the Amsterdam house and "found" his daughter's diary concealed in the rafters. The truth about the Anne Frank Diary was first revealed in 1959 by the Swedish journal *Fria Ord*. It established that the Jewish novelist Meyer Levin had written the dialogue of the "diary" and was demanding payment for his work in a court action against Otto Frank. A condensation of the Swedish articles appeared in the American Economic Council Letter, April 15th, 1959, as follows: "History has many examples of myths that live a longer and richer life than truth, and

may become more effective than truth. "The Western World has for some years been made aware of a Jewish girl through the medium of what purports to be her personally written story, Anne Frank's Diary. Any informed literary inspection of this book would have shown it to have been impossible as the work of a teenager. "A noteworthy decision of the New York Supreme Court confirms this point of view, in that the well known American Jewish writer, Meyer Levin, has been awarded \$50,000 to be paid him by the father of Anne Frank as an honorarium for Levin's work on the Anne Frank Diary. "Mr. Frank, in Switzerland, has promised to pay to his race kin, Meyer Levin, not less than \$50,000 because he had used the dialogue of Author Levin just as it was and "implanted" it in the diary as being his daughter's intellectual work." Further inquiries brought a reply on May 7th, 1962 from a firm of New York lawyers, which stated: "I was the attorney for Meyer Levin in his action against Otto Frank, and others. It is true that a jury awarded Mr. Levin \$50,000 in damages, as indicated in your letter. That award was later set aside by the trial justice, Hon. Samuel C. Coleman, on the ground that the damages had not been proved in the manner required by law. The action was subsequently settled while an appeal from Judge Coleman's decision was pending. "I am afraid that the case itself is not officially reported, so far as the trial itself, or even Judge Coleman's decision, is concerned. Certain procedural matters were reported in 141 New York Supplement, Second Series 170, and in 5 Second Series 181. The correct file number in the New York County Clerk's office is 2241 — 1956 and the file is probably a large and full one ..." Here, then, is just one more fraud in a whole series of frauds perpetrated in support of the "Holocaust" legend and the saga of the Six Million. Of course, the court case bearing directly on the authenticity of the Anne Frank Diary was "not officially reported". A brief reference may also be made to another "diary", published not long after that of Anne Frank and entitled: Notes from the Warsaw Ghetto: the Journal of Emmanuel Ringelblum (New York, 1958). Ringelblum had been a leader in the campaign of sabotage against the Germans in Poland, as well as the revolt of the Warsaw Ghetto in 1943, before he was eventually arrested and executed in 1944. The Ringelblum journal, which speaks of the usual "rumours" allegedly circulating about the extermination of the Jews in Poland, appeared under exactly the same Communist auspices as the so-called Höss memoirs. McGraw-Hill, the publishers of the American edition, admit that they were denied access to the uncensored original manuscript in Warsaw, and instead faithfully followed the expurgated volume published by the Communist Government in Warsaw in 1952. All the "proofs" of the Holocaust issuing from Communist sources of this kind are worthless as historical documents.

## **ACCUMULATING MYTHS**

Since the war, there has been an abundant growth of sensational concentration camp literature, the majority of it Jewish, each book piling horror upon horror, blending fragments of truth with the most grotesque of fantasies and impostures, relentlessly creating an edifice of mythology in which any relation to historical fact has long since disappeared. We have referred to the type already - Olga Lengyel's absurd Five Chimneys ("24,000 corpses handled every day"), Doctor at Auschwitz by Miklos Nyiszli, apparently a mythical and invented person, This was Auschwitz: The Story of a Murder

Camp by Philip Friedman, and so on ad nauseam The latest in this vein is *For Those I Loved* by Martin Gray (Bodley Head, 1973), which purports to be an account of his experiences at Treblinka camp in Poland. Gray specialised in selling fake antiques to America before turning to concentration camp memoirs. The circumstances surrounding the publication of his book, however, have been unique, because for the first time with works of this kind, serious doubt was cast on the authenticity of its contents. Even Jews, alarmed at the damage it might cause, denounced his book as fraudulent and questioned whether he had ever been at Treblinka at all, while B.B.C. radio pressed him as to why he had waited 28 years before writing of his experiences. It was interesting to observe that the "Personal Opinion" column of the London Jewish Chronicle, March 30th, 1973, although it roundly condemned Gray's book, nevertheless made grandiose additions to the myth of the Six Million. It stated that: "Nearly a million people were murdered in Treblinka in the course of a year. 18,000 were fed into the gas chambers every day." It is a pity indeed that so many people read and accept this kind of nonsense without exercising their minds. If 18,000 were murdered every day, the figure of one million would be reached in a mere 56 days, not "in the course of a year." This gigantic achievement would leave the remaining ten months of the year a total blank. 18,000 every day would in fact mean a total of 6,480,000 "in the course of a year." Does this mean that the Six Million died in twelve months at Treblinka? What about the alleged three or four million at Auschwitz? This kind of thing simply shows that, once the preposterous compromise figure of Six Million had scored a resounding success and become internationally accepted, any number of impossible permutations can be made and no one would even think to criticise them. In its review of Gray's book, the Jewish Chronicle column also provides a revealing insight into the fraudulent allegations concerning gas-chambers: "Gray recalls that the floors of the gas chambers sloped, whereas another survivor who helped to build them maintains that they were at a level ..." Occasionally, books by former concentration camp inmates appear which present a totally different picture of the conditions prevailing in them. Such is *Under Two Dictators* (London, 1950) by Margarete Buber. She was a German-Jewish woman who had experienced several years in the brutal and primitive conditions of a Russian prison camp before being sent to Ravensbrück, the German camp for women detainees, in August 1940. She noted that she was the only Jewish person in her contingent of deportees from Russia who was not straight away released by the Gestapo. Her book presents a striking contrast between the camps of Soviet Russia and Germany; compared to the squalor, disorder and starvation of the Russian camp, she found Ravensbrück to be clean, civilised and well-administered. Regular baths and clean linen seemed a luxury after her earlier experiences, and her first meal of white bread, sausage, sweet porridge and dried fruit prompted her to inquire of another camp inmate whether August 3rd, 1940, was some sort of holiday or special occasion. She observed, too, that the barracks at Ravensbrück were remarkably spacious compared to the crowded mud hut of the Soviet camp. In the final months of 1945, she experienced the progressive decline of camp conditions, the causes of which we shall examine later. Another account which is at total variance with popular propaganda is *Die Gestapo Lässt Bitten* (The Gestapo Invites You) by Charlotte Bormann, a Communist political prisoner who was also interned at Ravensbrück. Undoubtedly its most important revelation is the author's statement that rumours of gas executions were deliberate and



malicious inventions circulated among the prisoners by the Communists. This latter group did not accept Margarete Buber because of her imprisonment in Soviet Russia. A further shocking reflection on the post-war trials is the fact that Charlotte Bormann was not permitted to testify at the Rastadt trial of Ravensbrück camp personnel in the French occupation zone, the usual fate of those who denied the extermination legend.

## **8. THE NATURE and CONDITION OF WAR-TIME CONCENTRATION CAMPS**

In his recent book *Adolf Hitler* (London, 1973), Colin Cross, who brings more intelligence than is usual to many problems of this period, observes astutely that "The shuffling of millions of Jews around Europe and murdering them, in a time of desperate war emergency, was useless from any rational point of view" (p. 307). Quite so, and at this point we may well question the likelihood of this irrationalism, and whether it was even possible. Is it likely, that at the height of the war, when the Germans were fighting a desperate battle for survival on two fronts, they would have conveyed millions of Jews for miles to supposedly elaborate and costly slaughter houses?

To have conveyed three or four million Jews to Auschwitz alone (even supposing that such an inflated number existed in Europe, which it did not), would have placed an insuperable burden upon German transportation facilities which were strained to the limit in supporting the farflung Russian front. To have transported the mythical six million Jews and countless numbers of other nationalities to internment camps, and to have housed, clothed and fed them there, would simply have paralysed their military operations. There is no reason to suppose that the efficient Germans would have put their military fortunes at such risk.

On the other hand, the transportation of a reasonable 363,000 prisoners to Auschwitz in the course of the war (the number we know to have been registered there) at least makes sense in terms of the compulsory labour they supplied. In fact, of the 3 million Jews living in Europe, it is certain that no more than two million were ever interned at one time, and it is probable that the number was much closer to 1,500,000. We shall see later, in the Report of the Red Cross, that whole Jewish populations such as that of Slovakia avoided detention in camps, while others were placed in community ghettos like Theresienstadt. Moreover, from western Europe deportations were far fewer. The estimate of Reitlinger that only about 50,000 French Jews from a total population of 320,000 were deported and interned has been noted already.

The question must also be asked as to whether it could have been physically possible to destroy the millions of Jews that are alleged. Had the Germans enough time for it? Is it likely that they would have cremated people by the million when they were so short of manpower and required all prisoners of war for purposes of war production? Would it have been possible to destroy and remove all trace of a million people in six months? Could such enormous gatherings of Jews and executions on such a vast scale have been kept secret? These are the kind of questions that the critical, thinking person

should ask. And he will soon discover that not only the statistical and documentary evidence given here, but simple logistics combine to discredit the legend of the six million. Although it was impossible for millions to have been murdered in them, the nature and conditions of Germany's concentration camps have been vastly exaggerated to make the claim plausible. William Shirer, in a typically reckless passage, states that "All of the thirty odd principal Nazi concentration camps were death camps" (ibid, p. 1150). This is totally untrue, and is not even accepted now by the principal propagators of the extermination legend. Shirer also quotes Eugen Kogon's *The Theory and Practice of Hell* (N.Y. 1950, p. 227) which puts the total number of deaths in all of them at the ridiculous figure of 7,125,000, though Shirer admits in a footnote that this is "undoubtedly too high."

## **'DEATH CAMPS' BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN**

It is true that in 1945, Allied propaganda did claim that all the concentration camps, particularly those in Germany itself, were "death camps", but not for long. On this question, the eminent American historian Harry Elmer Barnes wrote: "These camps were first presented as those in Germany, such as Dachau, Belsen, Buchenwald, Sachsenhausen and Dora, but it was soon demonstrated that there had been no systematic extermination in those camps. Attention was then moved to Auschwitz, Treblinka, Belzec, Chelmno, Jonowska, Tarnow, Ravensbrück, Mauthausen, Brezeczka and Birkenau, which does not exhaust the list that appears to have been extended as needed" (Rampart Journal, Summer 1967).

What had happened was that certain honest observers among the British and American occupation forces in Germany, while admitting that many inmates had died of disease and starvation in the final months of the war, had found no evidence after all of "gas chambers".

As a result, eastern camps in the Russian zone of occupation such as Auschwitz and Treblinka gradually came to the fore as horrific centres of extermination (though no one was permitted to see them), and this tendency has lasted to the present day. Here in these camps it was all supposed to have happened, but with the Iron Curtain brought down firmly over them, no one has ever been able to verify such charges.

The Communists claimed that four million people died at Auschwitz in gigantic gas chambers accommodating 2,000 people — and no one could argue to the contrary. What is the truth about so-called "gas chambers"?

Stephen F. Pinter, who served as a lawyer for the United States War Department in the occupation forces in Germany and Austria for six years after the war, made the following statement in the widely read Catholic magazine *Our Sunday Visitor*, June 14th, 1959: "I was in Dachau for 17 months after the war, as a U.S. Department Attorney, and can state that there was no gas chamber at Dachau. What was shown to visitors and sightseers there and erroneously described as a gas chamber was a crematory. Nor was there a gas chamber in any of the other concentration camps in Germany. We

were told that there was a gas chamber at Auschwitz, but since that was in the Russian zone of occupation, we were not permitted to investigate since the Russians would not allow it. From what I was able to determine during six postwar years in Germany and Austria, there were a number of Jews killed, but the figure of a million was certainly never reached. I interviewed thousands of Jews, former inmates of concentration camps in Germany and Austria, and consider myself as well qualified as any man on this subject." This tells a very different story from the customary propaganda. Pinter, of course, is very astute on the question of the crematory being represented as a gas chamber. This is a frequent ploy because **no such thing as a gas chamber has ever been shown to exist in these camps**, hence the deliberately misleading term a "gas oven", aimed at confusing a gas chamber with a crematorium.

The latter, usually a single furnace and similar to the kind of thing employed today, were used quite simply for the cremation of those persons who had *died from various natural causes* within the camp, particularly infectious diseases. This fact was conclusively proved by the German archbishop, Cardinal Faulhaber of Munich. He informed the Americans that during the Allied air raids on Munich in September 1944, 30,000 people were killed. The archbishop requested the authorities at the time to cremate the bodies of the victims in the crematorium at Dachau. But he was told that, unfortunately, this plan could not be carried out; the crematorium, having only one furnace, was not able to cope with the bodies of the air raid victims. Clearly, therefore, it could not have coped with the 238,000 Jewish bodies which were allegedly cremated there. In order to do so, the crematorium would have to be kept going for 326 years without stopping and 530 tons of ashes would have been recovered.

## **CASUALTY FIGURES REDUCED**

The figures of Dachau casualties are typical of the kind of exaggerations that have since had to be drastically revised. In 1946, a memorial plaque was unveiled at Dachau by Philip Auerbach, the Jewish State-Secretary in the Bavarian Government who was convicted for embezzling money which he claimed as compensation for non-existent Jews. The plaque read: "This area is being retained as a shrine to the 238,000 individuals who were cremated here." Since then, the official casualty figures have had to be steadily revised downwards, and now stand at only 20,600 the majority from typhus and starvation only at the end of the war. This deflation, to ten per cent of the original figure, will doubtless continue, and one day will be applied to the legendary figure of six million as a whole.

Another example of drastic revision is the present estimate of Auschwitz casualties. The absurd allegations of three or four million deaths there are no longer plausible even to Reitlinger. He now puts the number of casualties at only 600,000; and although this figure is still exaggerated in the extreme, it is a significant reduction on four million and further progress is to be expected. Shirer himself quotes Reitlinger's latest estimate, but he fails to reconcile this with his earlier statement that half of that figure, about 300,000

Hungarian Jews were supposedly "done to death in forty-six days" - a supreme example of the kind of irresponsible nonsense that is written on this subject.

## **HUMANE CONDITIONS**

That several thousand camp inmates did die in the chaotic final months of the war brings us to the question of their war-time conditions. These have been deliberately falsified in innumerable books of an extremely lurid and unpleasant kind. The Red Cross Report, examined below, demonstrates conclusively that throughout the war the camps were well administered. The working inmates received a daily ration even throughout 1943 and 1944 of not less than 2,750 calories, which was more than double the average civilian ration in occupied Germany in the years after 1945.

The internees were under regular medical care, and those who became seriously ill were transferred to hospital. All internees, unlike those in Soviet camps, could receive parcels of food, clothing and pharmaceutical supplies from the Special Relief Division of the Red Cross. The Office of the Public Prosecutor conducted thorough investigations into each case of criminal arrest, and those found innocent were released; those found guilty, as well as those deportees convicted of major crimes within the camp, were sentenced by military courts and executed. In the Federal Archives of Koblenz there is a directive of January 1943 from Himmler regarding such executions, stressing that "no brutality. is to be allowed" (Manvell and Frankl), *ibid*, p. 312).

Occasionally there was brutality, but such cases were immediately scrutinised by S.S. Judge Dr. Konrad Morgen of the Reich Criminal Police Office, whose job was to investigate irregularities at the various camps. Morgen himself prosecuted commander Koch of Buchenwald in 1943 for excesses at his camp, a trial to which the German public were invited. It is significant that Oswald Pohl, the administrator of the concentration camp system who was dealt with so harshly at Nuremberg, was in favour of the death penalty for Koch. In fact, the S.S. court did sentence Koch to death, but he was given the option of serving on the Russian front. Before he could do this, however, Prince Waldeck, the leader of the S.S. in the district, carried out his execution. This case is ample proof of the seriousness with which the S.S. regarded unnecessary brutality.

Several S.S. court actions of this kind were conducted in the camps during the war to prevent excesses, and more than 800 cases were investigated before 1945. Morgen testified at Nuremberg that he discussed confidentially with hundreds of inmates the prevailing conditions in the camps. He found few that were undernourished except in the hospitals, and noted that the pace and achievement in compulsory labour by inmates was far lower than among German civilian workers.

The evidence of Pinter and Cardinal Faulhaber has been shown to disprove the claims of extermination at Dachau, and we have seen how the casualty figures of that camp have been continuously revised downwards. The camp at Dachau near Munich, in fact,

may be taken as fairly typical of these places of internment. Compulsory labour in the factories and plants was the order of the day, but the Communist leader Ernst Ruff testified in his Nuremberg affidavit of April 18th, 1947 that the treatment of prisoners on the work details and in the camp of Dachau remained humane. The Polish underground leader, Jan Piechowiak, who was at Dachau from May 22nd, 1940 until April 29th, 1945 also testified on March 21st, 1946 that prisoners there received good treatment, and that the S.S. personnel at the camp were "well disciplined".

Berta Schirotschin, who worked in the food service at Dachau throughout the war, testified that the working inmates, until the beginning of 1945 and despite increasing privation in Germany, received their customary second breakfast at 10 a.m. every morning.

In general, hundreds of affidavits from Nuremberg testify to the humane conditions prevailing in concentration camps; but emphasis was invariably laid on those which reflected badly on the German administration and could be used for propaganda purposes. A study of the documents also reveals that Jewish witnesses who resented their deportation and internment in prison camps tended to greatly exaggerate the rigours of their condition, whereas other nationals interned for political reasons, such as those cited above, generally presented a more balanced picture. In many cases, prisoners such as Charlotte Bormann, whose experiences did not accord with the picture presented at Nuremberg, were not permitted to testify.

## **UNAVOIDABLE CHAOS**

The orderly situation prevailing in the German concentration camps slowly broke down in the last fearful months of 1945. The Red Cross Report of 1948 explains that the saturation bombing by the Allies paralysed the transport and communications system of the Reich, no food reached the camps and starvation claimed an increasing number of victims, both in prison camps and among the civilian population of Germany. This terrible situation was compounded in the camps both by great overcrowding and the consequent outbreak of typhus epidemics.

Overcrowding occurred as a result of prisoners from the eastern camps such as Auschwitz being evacuated westward before the Russian advance; columns of such exhausted people arrived at several German camps such as Belsen and Buchenwald which had themselves reached a state of great hardship. Belsen camp near Bremen was in an especially chaotic condition in these months and Himmler's physician, Felix Kersten, an anti-Nazi, explains that its unfortunate reputation as a "death camp" was due solely to the ferocity of the typhus epidemic which broke out there in March 1945 (Memoirs 1940-1945, London, 1956).

Undoubtedly these fearful conditions cost several thousand lives, and it is these conditions that are represented in the photographs of emaciated human beings and heaps of corpses which the propagandists delight in showing, claiming, that they are

victims of "extermination". A surprisingly honest appraisal of the situation at Belsen in 1945 appeared in Purnell's History of the Second World War (Vol. 7, No. 15) by Dr. Russell Barton, now superintendent and consultant psychiatrist at Severalls Hospital, Essex, who spent one month at the camp as a medical student after the war. His account vividly illustrates the true causes of the mortality that occurred in such camps toward the war's end, and how such extreme conditions came to prevail there. Dr. Barton explains that Brigadier Glyn Hughes, the British Medical Officer who took command of Belsen in 1945, "did not think there had been any atrocities in the camp" despite discipline and hard work "Most people," writes Dr. Barton, "attributed the conditions of the inmates to deliberate intention on the part of the Germans. Inmates were eager to cite examples of brutality and neglect, and visiting journalists from different countries interpreted the situation according to the needs of propaganda at home."

However, Dr. Barton makes it quite clear that the conditions of starvation and disease were unavoidable in the circumstances and that they occurred only during the months of 1945. "From discussions with prisoners it seemed that conditions in the camp were not too bad until late 1944. The huts were set among pine trees and each was provided with lavatories, wash basins, showers and stoves for heating." The cause of food shortage is also explained. "German medical officers told me that it had been increasingly difficult to transport food to the camp for some months. Anything that moved on the autobahns was likely to be bombed ... I was surprised to find records, going back for two or three years, of large quantities of food cooked daily for distribution. At that time I became convinced, contrary to popular opinion, that there had never been a policy of deliberate starvation. This was confirmed by the large numbers of well-fed inmates.

Why then were so many people suffering from mal-nutrition? ... The major reasons for the state of Belsen were disease, gross overcrowding by central authority, lack of law and order within the huts, and inadequate supplies of food, water and drugs." The lack of order, which led to riots over food distribution, was quelled by British machine-gun fire and a display of force when British tanks and armoured cars toured the camp.

Apart from the unavoidable deaths in these circumstances, Glyn Hughes estimated that about "1,000 were killed through the kindness of English soldiers giving them their own rations and chocolates."

As a man who was at Belsen, Dr. Barton is obviously very much alive to the falsehoods of concentration camp mythology, and he concludes: "In trying to assess the causes of the conditions found in Belsen one must be alerted to the tremendous visual display, ripe for purposes of propaganda, that masses of starved corpses presented." To discuss such conditions "naively in terms of 'goodness' and 'badness' is to ignore the constituent factors ..."

---

***Free receipt, possession, dissemination, discussion and transmission of this document (or documents contained in this collection or archive) are all hereby claimed and maintained as under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; including (but not limited to) those following:***

## **From the Universal Declaration of Human Rights**

### ***Article Twelve of the Universal Declaration***

- 1. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy,** family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation.
- 2. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law** against such interference or attacks.

### ***Article Eighteen of the Universal Declaration***

**Everyone has the right to freedom of thought,** conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

### ***Article Nineteen of the Universal Declaration***

**Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression;** this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and **to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.**

## ***FAIR USE NOTICE***

*This site contains copyrighted material, the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available in our efforts to advance understanding of environmental, political, human rights, economic, scientific, and social justice issues etc.*

### **US LAW**

We believe that our use of any such copyrighted material constitutes a 'fair use' as provided for in section 107 of the US Copyright Law. In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes. For more information go to: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml>.

### **EU LAW**

As regards the use of copyrighted material within the European Union. The [European Directive 2001/29/EC](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council of 22 May 2001 on the harmonisation of certain aspects of copyright and related rights in the information society provides in its art. 5 an exhaustive list of exemptions that can be implemented by the Member States.

Amongst that list, the exemption(s) invoked must cover the reproduction and communication to the public (since the publication on the Internet implies those two acts). Generally, exemptions will be based on the purpose of the intended use. For instance, the Directive provides for an exemption to the exclusive right of reproduction and communication to the public when it is made ***for the sole purpose of illustration for teaching or scientific research, as long as the source, including the author's name, is indicated, unless this turns out to be impossible and to the extent justified by the non-commercial purpose to be achieved.***

Another exemption is "reproduction by the press, ***communication to the public or making available of published articles on current economic, political or religious topics or of broadcast works or other subject-matter of the same character, in cases where such use is not expressly reserved, and as long as the source, including the author's name, is indicated, or use of works or other subject-matter in connection with the reporting of current events, to the extent justified by the informatory purpose and as long as the source, including the author's name, is indicated, unless this turns out to be impossible***".

All the exceptions must comply with the three step test which imply that exemptions must only apply in certain special cases (1) which do not conflict with a normal exploitation of the work or other subject-matter (2) and do not unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the rightholder (3).

If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission from the copyright owner.



# **UNDERSTANDING THE JEWS, UNDERSTANDING ANTI-SEMITISM**

**Hervé Ryssen**

UNDERSTANDING THE JEWS,  
UNDERSTANDING ANTI-SEMITISM

by Hervé Ryssen

Translated from French by Carlos W. Porter.

(c) 2014 by Carlos Whitlock Porter. All rights reserved.  
ISBN 978-1-312-39077-5

## *Table of Contents*

Preliminary Remarks .....	4
I. The Jewish Identity .....	5
II. Cosmopolitan Propaganda .....	13
III. The New World Order .....	24
IV. Historical Traumas .....	31
V. Anti-Semitism .....	43
VI. The Mafia .....	55
VII. The Destruction of the Traditional Family .....	66
VIII. The Psychopathology of “Anti-Semitism” .....	72
IX. At Last: Psychoanalysis Explained .....	75
X. The Hysterical Sect.....	81

## **Preliminary Remarks**

The following text is a summary of six books written by Hervé Ryssen, published between 2005 and 2010, constituting the most important study on the Jewish mind ever published. All the quotations that you are about to read are precisely referenced in at least one of these books.

The present booklet consists for the most part of quotations from famous authors, with particular emphasis on well-known films. The number of references is nevertheless sufficient to enable the reader to observe the extraordinary homogeneity of Jewish cosmopolitan thought, over the centuries and across all borders.

# I

## The Jewish Identity

The Jews are scattered over all the countries of the world, on all five continents, but they reside principally in ethnically European countries. Most of them are of “Ashkenazi” origin, that is, from Central and Eastern Europe, which they left in successive waves starting at the end of the 19th century. A minority, also scattered over the entire surface of the globe, come from the Mediterranean basin: these are the so-called “Sephardic” Jews. But there are also a few black Jews in Ethiopia, called Fallashas, as well as Jews in India and China, for example, who claim to be “*perfectly well integrated*”. The Jews are not, therefore, a race.

Judaism is not only not a religion – or not only – since many Jews declare themselves atheists; and are nonetheless no less “*Jewish*” for it. Marxist Jews in particular, who form the ruling elite in Western countries, are fanatical militants for atheism, according to the doctrines invented by one of their own: Karl Marx.

What, then, is Judaism? Let us ask Nahum Goldman, founder of the World Jewish Congress. From 1956 to 1968, Nahum Goldman was both President of the World Jewish Congress and President of the World Zionist Organisation. In 1976, he published a book entitled *The Jewish Paradox*. When someone asked him for his definition of Judaism, Nahum Goldman replied: “*There is no entirely satisfactory definition... I remember having spoken at a conference when I was a student, during which I proposed more than twenty definitions: Judaism is a religion, a people, a nation, a cultural community, etc. No one definition is absolutely correct.*”

All the Jewish intellectuals who have approached the problem respond in the same way: Judaism, they invariably say, is an “*enigma*”, a “*mystery*”. These terms reappear regularly in nearly all Jewish writings. “*The Jewish people do not know what they are*”, wrote the philosopher Alain Finkelkraut (*The Imaginary Jew*). They are “*an enigma to the contemporary mind*” (Bernard-Henry Levy); they are a “*mystery*”, a “*deeply distressing phenomenon*” (Jean Daniel); “*The Jews have been a living question mark to their surroundings for two thousand years*” (André Glucksmann).

And all this – they think – despite the fact that they are supposed to be “*God’s Chosen People*”. While this doesn’t mean a lot to a *goy*, it is of utmost importance to a Jew.

## **“Perfectly Well Integrated”**

Jews almost always claim to be “*perfectly well integrated*” into the countries in which they live, and they usually declare themselves to be “*patriots*”. Their own statements nevertheless indicate that, behind a facade of national identity, they continue to feel very Jewish, profoundly concerned with the interests of the Jewish community and the State of Israel.

In 1968, Bernard-Henry Levy, a well-known “French” philosopher who is very fond of media hype, declared, with regards to his book entitled *The French Ideology* – which was intended to make the French feel guilty – that: “*I am a “Frenchman and, as a Frenchman, like no other French philosopher, I took the risk of conducting this inquiry into black France”*. Twenty years later, in another book entitled “*Recidivists*”, published in 2004, he wrote that he felt “*an extreme attachment to Israel... I am a Jew, of course, through my link to Israel. I am a Jew when, like all the world’s Jews, my heart beats in unison with those of the threatened Israelis*”. And he continues: “*I am a Jew, I am a Jew through every fibre of my being. I am a Jew through my slips of the tongue. I am a Jew for the alimentary rules which I have imposed upon myself... I am a Jew through my writing style... I am a Jew through this invisible pact which links me to the Jews of the whole world... I am a Jew through my Messianic patience*.” Examples of this kind are not hard to find, since nearly all Jewish intellectuals have expressed this same paradox in the same terms. The word “*paradox*” reappears regularly in the writings of all Jewish intellectuals, all over the world, throughout all history: this is not an accident.

## **Assimilation or Dissimulation?**

The Jews have long been accustomed to adopt the dress of the people amongst whom they live. They speak the language of the country without foreign accent; they appear to adopt the local mores and customs. But they live in a world of their own, cut off from the world of *goyim* – “cattle”, “non-Jews”. They conceal themselves beneath borrowed identities for centuries, wearing the identity of their host

peoples by day and becoming Jews again at night.

Many Jews change their names or transform their original family names, mimicking the local language. Thus, “Minkowski” becomes “Minc”; “Shapiro” becomes “Chapiraud” or “Chapier”. The make-up job may be exaggerated to a greater or lesser degree: “Aaron” becomes “Nora”, “Nussenbaum” becomes “Rochebrune”.

The actor Kirk Douglas (“Demskey”) preferred a Scottish name. The head of the French diplomatic service under President Sarkozy, Jean-David Levitt, is obviously a “Levi”.

## **Jewish Solidarity**

The Jews exhibit an instinctive solidarity with their own people. This inclination is easily verified in the praises heaped by journalists upon Jewish artists and writers, whom they never hesitate to describe as “*a genius*”, their work as “*sublime*”, “*incomparable*”, etc. We are all, in fact, well aware of the tendency of Jewish intellectuals to cry “*genius!*” upon the discovery of almost any work by a fellow Jew.

Thus it is that second-rate writers like Philip Roth, Imre Kertesz, Yasmira Reza or Jonathan Littell are elevated to the rank of “*geniuses of humanity*”, raking in literary prizes in the process. Kafka, of course, becomes “*the greatest writer in German history*”, while Vassili Grossman becomes “*the Tolstoy of the twentieth century*”. Ironically, it is precisely through this very tendency to heap exaggerated praise on each other that we infallibly recognise Jewish journalists behind their pilfered cognomens.

The famous writer Elie Wiesel heartily confirms the notion that the Jews are a nation apart, and that it is correct to consider them “*strangers*” living amongst “*other peoples*”. In his book, *Testament of a Murdered Jewish Poet* (1980), he writes explicitly: “*Between a Moroccan businessman and a chemist from Chicago, a rag dealer from Lodz, and an industrialist from Lyon, a kabbalist from Safed and an intellectual from Minsk, there is a deeper, more substantial blood relationship than between two citizens of the same country, the same city and the same profession. A Jew is never alone*”.

## **A Community Closed upon Itself**

The Jews have always avoided mixing with the *goyim*. This is how they have always managed to survive over the centuries and persist where

other civilizations have disappeared forever. The struggle against mixed marriages, in particular, is a constant priority. The Prime Minister of Israel, Golda Meir, declared:

*“The greatest danger threatening Jewish life comes not from anti-Semitism or persecution, but from assimilation and mixed marriages”.* Jewish intellectuals often repeat this slogan: the number of mixed marriages each year amounts to *“several trainloads departing for Auschwitz”*. Rabbis never tire of warning young Jews against this plague, while attempting to obtain from them the solemn promise to marry only another Jew.

On the other hand, it is very difficult for a *goy* to convert to Judaism. When a non-Jew wants to convert, it is the custom to discourage him, snub him, make him feel unwelcome. It is always simpler for a *goyische* woman to marry a Jew.

Jews live in the constant shadow of their own ghetto, associating with fellow Jews almost exclusively.

*“The ghetto is historically a Jewish invention”*, writes Nahum Goldman. *“It is incorrect to say that the goyim forced the Jews to separate themselves from their societies. By the time the Christians even noticed the existence of the ghettos, the Jews were already living there.”* This same truth has been expressed by many other Jews as well (see our *History of Anti-Semitism*, 2010).

In a book published in 1982 and prefaced by the Grand Rabbi of France, Ernest Gugenheim expresses this feeling of belonging: *“Israel forms a united body into which its members are firmly welded”*. Nahum Goldman cites the famous verse from the Talmud: *“One single Jew is like all of Judaism”*. This is why Jewish intellectuals often write *“the Jew”* to speak of the Jews.

Endogamous marriage is one reason for the amazing similarity in the facial characteristics of Jews all over the world. The very influential Alain Minc, for example, bears a very close resemblance to Paul Wolfowitz, one of the “hawks” in the American government during the Second Iraq War (2003). Elie Wiesel father bore an extraordinary resemblance to that of Bela Kun (Cohen), the leader of the Communist Revolution in Hungary in 1919. This explains the clichés observable in all *“anti-Semitic cartoons”* – particularly, cartoons published before WWII, when there was no plastic surgery and mixed marriages were less common.

In actual fact, however, the lugubrious warnings against mixed marriages issued by Jewish leaders the world over fail to prevent a significant number of Jews from marrying *goyim*. Sometimes their children are as Jewish as their parents, at least in spirit; but sometimes



their Jewishness is lost, sometimes in the very first generation, if not later – a fact which fills the rabbis with anguish.

## The Jewish Mission

The Jewish people consider themselves the bearers of a project governing humanity as a whole, a grandiose project which they have pursued for centuries, through and despite everything: the instauration on earth of universal and lasting peace. The notion of “*peace*”, in fact, lies at the very heart of Judaism: it is not by chance that this one word (“*shalom*”, in Hebrew) appears so frequently in the speech of all Jews, all over the world. It is not just a religious concept – one of a belief in God’s work in a distant future – but of a guiding principle which determines the commitments of Jews on a daily basis. It is in fact the Jews themselves, who, through their work, their actions, their involvement in politics, work each day for the construction of this “*peace*”.

In the perfect world which they believe they are creating, all conflict will have completely vanished from the face of the earth – particularly, conflict between nations. That is why, wherever they settle, Jews militate ceaselessly and untiringly for the elimination of all borders and the breakdown of all national identity. Nation states are the cause of war and disorder; they must, therefore, be hollowed out from within and without, and – in the long run – eliminated entirely, replaced by World Government, solely capable of bringing about the reign of human felicity and endless prosperity on Earth.

The aim is to unify the world by all means possible, levelling all cultural differences, which are believed to be the source of conflict. Jewish intellectuals, all over the world, work without letup for this ideal. Whether Left or Right, Marxist or liberal, believers or atheists, Zionists or “*perfectly integrated*”, Jews are the world’s most fervent advocates of this messianic global empire.

Judaism is, therefore, essentially a universalist political project, the objective of which is the unification of the world, as the prelude to global pacification. It is a long, difficult job, they admit, but the Jews are absolutely convinced that they can succeed in achieving this aim, obsessed, as they are, with the “Mission” entrusted to them by God. Or as the prophet Isaiah puts it: “*The wolf will live with the lamb, the leopard will lie down with the goat, the calf and the lion and the yearling together; and a little child will lead them...*” (Isaiah, XI, 6-9).

Contrary to Christianity or Islam, the Jews do not intend to convert

others to Judaism; rather, they intend simply to persuade them to renounce their religion, their race, their identity, their family and all their traditions, in the name of “*Humanity*”, and “*Human Rights*”. This Global Empire, in fact, can only be built upon the ruins of great civilizations, using the human detritus produced by so-called “*democratic societies*” and the capitalist system.

“*Cosmopolitan*” (i.e., Jewish) propaganda always aims at the dissolution of all ancestral values and identities, so as to eliminate the supposed “*sources of conflict between men*”. The Jews militate continually towards this goal. The Jews are a people of propagandists. It is not an accident that they have been highly successful in all of our contemporary media-obsessed “*democratic*” societies. When only the remaining Jews on Earth shall have preserved their faith and traditions, only then will they be finally recognised by all as “*God’s Chosen People*”. Only then will their long-awaited Messiah finally arrive and re-establish “*the Kingdom of David*”.

This Messianic “Waiting for Godeau” is the driving force of Judaism, since it obliges every Jew to struggle actively to “*hasten the coming of the Messiah*” (this is a very common expression). It is from this Messianic tension that the Jews derive their strength and energy. It is in fact the Jews themselves who, through their militancy, their untiring egalitarian propaganda in favour of a “*world without borders*”, are fated to establish the world of “*peace*” to hasten the arrival of the Messiah.

## Human Rights

The concept of “Human Rights” is a very effective weapon in advancing the idea of “*world unification*”. The “father” of the “Universal Declaration of Human Rights”, in 1948, was a certain René Cassin. It was he who was responsible for establishing the Constitution of the French Fifth Republic after the return of Charles de Gaulle in 1958. René Cassin was the President of the European Court of Human Rights, and was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1968. He was also a *doctor honoris causa* of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and President of the Universal Israelite Alliance from 1943 until his death in 1976. “*Human Rights*”, he said, are a “*laicisation of the principles of Judaism*”. This was confirmed by Grand Rabbi Jacob Kaplan: “*To find the seminal sources of [the French Revolution of] 1789, one must go back beyond classical antiquity, to the Bible, the Torah and the prophets*”. René Cassin also envisaged a sort of “*Universal Ministry of*

*Education*". These projects were only concretised after the war, through the creation of UNESCO.

## **The Jews and "Humanity"**

It is interesting to note that Jewish intellectuals – who are always talking about "Humanity" – instinctively confuse themselves – the Jews – with "Humanity". Elie Wiesel writes as follows: *"To save our people, we must save all of humanity"*. Kafka said, *"Whosoever strikes a Jew knocks all of humanity to the ground"*. Nahum Goldman expressed the same idea this way: *"It is in the interests of all of humanity that the Jewish people must not disappear"*, he said, since the Jews are the bearer of *"values which concern all of humanity"*.

In his book *Five New Lectures on the Talmud* (1977) the philosopher Emmanuel Levinas projects Jewish singularity onto a universal level, and speaks of *"the suffering of Israel as universal suffering"*.

Jacques Attali says the same thing in *The Jews, The World and Money* (2002): *"A misfortune for the Jewish people is a misfortune for all men"*, taking the same logic even further: *"The disappearance of the Temple was also a tragedy for all non-Jews, since the Hebrews prayed for them: they know not what they have lost"*.

Elie Wiesel was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in late 1986. In his *"Oslo Speech"*, pronounced on this occasion, he spoke – as was his custom – of *"Hope"*, of *"Humanity"* and *"Peace" on Earth*: *"Jewish suffering should be of concern to all of humanity. The day will come when crimes against the Jews will be considered crimes against humanity, and crimes against humanity as crimes against the Jewish people"*. Under these conditions, "anti-Semitism" is not just a "Jewish matter": it is a matter of concern to *"Everyone"*.

## **Esperanto**

The elimination of borders is an ideal to be attained, but the *"open"* society will only be viable on the condition of the annihilation of all instincts of race and local characteristics. The *"pure races"* must be *"mixed"* to dissolve all feeling of identity, which is considered likely to engender the resurgence of "Nationalism". Languages themselves must disappear, to the benefit of one single common language.

This was the great ambition of Louis Lazaré Zamenhof. A young

man descended from the Jewish aristocracy of Poland, his entire life was dedicated, from a very early age, to the invention of a language which was to be understood by everyone, based on common roots from most of the wide-spread languages.

This dream led to the publication of the founding work of Esperanto, *Fundamento de Esperanto* in 1887. Zamenhof explained: “*If I were not a Jew from the ghetto, the idea of uniting humanity either would never have entered my mind, or would not have obsessed me so obstinately throughout my entire life*”. And he repeated: “*My Jewishness was the principal cause for which I dedicated myself to one idea and to an essential dream, from my youngest childhood, the dream of uniting humanity.*”

## II

### Cosmopolitan Propaganda

There are different ways to “pacify” men and nations. Carpet bombing, or Soviet totalitarianism, is one way. But “liberal democracy” and the “consumer society” work much better.

#### The Advocacy of Race-Mixing and the “Open Society”

Jews have always encouraged immigration into all the countries in which they have ever settled, not just because a multicultural society corresponds to their politico-religious plans, but also because the resulting dissolution of national identity protects them from any “*nationalistic*” upheavals. All Jewish intellectuals – absolutely without exception – are focused on this question of the “*plural*” society and are obsessed with ceaseless “*anti-racist vigilance*”, regardless of any other political differences. Immigration from the Third World is thus presented as “*an economic necessity*”, an “*indispensable contribution*”, an “*extraordinary enrichment*”, etc.

Jewish intellectuals exhibit a certain characteristic inclination towards enormous untruths. They will tell you, for example, that immigration hasn’t really increased at all; on the contrary, it has never been so low! This inclination to treat the *goyim* like a load of simple-minded fools is called “*chutzpah*” (pronounced with a German-style guttural “r”). The demographer Gerard Noiriel, the essayist Guy Sorman, the sociologist Edgar Morin (Nahoum), the philosopher Alain Finkelkraut and diplomat Stephane Hessel, for example, became famous for these little exercises.

To the general public, this unceasing, indefatigable, planetary propaganda is most obvious in film production. All Jewish film producers have released at least one or more films advocating race-mixing and the “*multicultural society*”. Just watch the films by Claude Longmann, known as “Berri” (*One Stays, The Other Leaves*); Matthieu Kassovitz (*Café au lait, White Nightmare*); Claude Lelouch (*Itinerary of a Spoilt Child; Smic Smac Smoc*), Francois Luciani (*The Man Who Came from Somewhere Else*) Edouard Molinaro (*The Hearts of Men*),

Gerard Oury – at the end of *The Adventures of Rabbi Jacob*, the Arab Slimane, naturally, marries Pivert's daughter – Robert Guédignan (*Where the Heart Is*). Guédignan also produced *Marius and Jeanette*, in which the main character, Jeanette, lives alone in Marseilles with her two children, fathered by two different men. The older daughter has been duped by a cad who deserted her – a white man (naturally) – while her 12-year old is an African half-caste who “works very well at school”, etc.

Renaud Cohen is a small-time producer, but his film *Once We Grow Up* (2001) is rather eloquent: the main character, Simon Dadoun, is a thirty-year old Jewish journalist. He breaks up with his girl friend (a *goy*) and meets a Sephardic Jewess, like himself. The French, by contrast, are depicted as much inclined towards race-mixing: Both of Simon Dadoun's friends, in fact, are interracially married: one to an Asian, the other to a Senegalese. The same film also defends lesbianism – again – in a highly “multicultural” context.

Or just watch the films by Bernard Stora (*Another Life*), Giles Pacquet-Brenner (*Gomez and Tavares*), Daniel Vignes (*Fatou from Mali*), Dominique Baron (*The Tress of Aminata*), Cedric Kahn (*Too Much Happiness*), Nicolas Ribowski (*Perigord Noir*), etc. In *The Enchanted Parentheses* (1999), by Michael Spinosa, the French are once again depicted as fated to mate with Blacks and Orientals. The producer also depicts adultery, Marxism, feminism, etc., with great indulgence.

“American” Jewish film producers are obsessed with these same things as well. You really must see films like Roland Emmerich's (*The Day After Tomorrow*, 2004), or Marc Forster's (*Monster's Ball*). In *Love Field* (1993), Jonathan Kaplan tells the story of a beautiful blonde who leaves her idiot of a husband and falls in love with a Black.

In *Guess Who's Coming to Dinner* (1967), a young beauty introduces her husband to her parents. Her husband is a Black, likeable, cultured, intelligent. His natural charm and niceness overcome the instinctive and vicious mistrust of her bourgeois white parents. The film, by Stanley Kramer, naturally won ten Oscar nominations.

You can go much further back than that if you wish: *West Side Story*, by Robert Wise (1961), is a musical propaganda film in favour of the “multicultural society”. In 1950, *No Way Out* told the story of a black intern in a hospital. It was a plea against “racism” by Joseph Mankiewicz.

Today, early in the 21st century, this propaganda is becoming even more extreme. The television series “*Life's So Sweet*” shows young white women mating with Blacks, while young white men are depicted

as homosexuals.

All the screen plays for the films listed above were written by Olivier Schulzinger; in fact, any time you see a white woman paired off with a Negro on the screen, you can be very sure that you're watching something produced by the "*Chosen Ones*". As we can easily see, the Jews are totally obsessed with race-mixing and ethnic mixing; but one must, of course, bear in mind that this "*line of goods*" is intended for "*export only*".

## Making Whites Feel Guilty

"Cosmopolitan" film producers work untiringly to make Europeans feel profoundly guilty for their past, to make them ashamed of what they are. All these incessant "*sensitisation*" campaigns on topics like "*slavery*", "*colonialism*", the "*looting of the Third World*", "*global warming*", "*Auschwitz*", etc., have one object – and one object only – and that is to bring about the advent of world government.

In "cosmopolitan" Jewish cinema, psychopaths and villains are invariably depicted as possessing typically Nordic traits, complete with blonde hair and blue eyes. This is not an accident. In *The Crimson Rivers* (2000), for example, Matthieu Kassovitz shows us dangerous "neo-Nazis" torturing and massacring innocent people.

*Six-Pack* (1999) is a film by Alain Berberian: a Parisian commissioner of police is anxious to capture a serial killer who has already killed and mutilated five young women. The "bad guys" (the chief of police, the psychopath) are played by Nordics, while the "good guys" (Commissioner Nathan, Inspector Saul), are, once again, are played by very typical Mediterranean-types.

"American" film directors are animated by all these same hatreds. In *Panic Room* (2001), by David Fincher, three criminals break into a house. The gang leader is a white man, a very frightening, unpredictable, highly nervous person, who ends up with a bullet in the head. The second criminal – another white man – seems very calm, but is, in reality, an extremely dangerous psychopath and "mad-dog killer". The third, a Negro, is intelligent and humane. None of this is by accident.

See *Runaway Jury*, by Garry Fleder; *The Green Line*, by Frank "Darabont"; *Fatal Obsession*, by Jonathan Kaplan; *Ragtime*, by Milos Forman; or *Barton Fink*, by the Cohen Brothers, and you will see that the "bad guys" are systematically depicted as white men, and white men only. In *Cop Land* (1995), by the extremely sly James "Mangold"

(Goldman), the “bad guys” are all white cops, while on the other side of the river, in New York, the “multiracial” police are portrayed with the greatest sympathy.

In the comedy entitled *Addams Family Values* (1993) the characters whom the audience initially mistakes for the “bad guys” – real villains – are, in fact, very nice (with very black hair), while the “bad guys” are invariably blonde-haired children. The film is by Barry Sonnenfeld.

*Mississippi Burning* (1988) by Alan Parker, is an attack on the Ku Klux Klan. In a little village in the southern United States, the whites are all bigoted, racially-prejudiced cowards, narrow-minded, evil, and downright contemptible. The women are depicted as intimidated, bullied into submission, dreaming only of escape.

In *Alien 3* (1992), a space ship crashes on a planet where the “Company” once built a penitentiary for dangerous criminals: killers, rapists, and psychopaths. The “bad guys” attempting to rape the heroine are, of course, all white, while the “good guy” who rescues her from this terrifying predicament is a huge Negro, the only mentally-balanced person among the prisoners: he’s the boss. This film was also produced by an “alien”: David Fincher.

In the 1960s, Jewish film makers did everything they could to make white people feel guilty. Just watch films like *In the Heat of the Night* (1967), by Norman Jewison (who won five Oscars for it), *The Cardinal* (1963), by Otto Preminger or *Wild River* by Elia Kazan (1960).

In *Betrayed* (USA, 1989), Constantin Costa-Gavras denounces the paramilitary militia of the American “Extreme Right”: a beautiful young FBI agent, a woman, is ordered to infiltrate them. The main villain, “Gary”, falls quickly in love with her, and reveals his true nature as a dangerous psychopath with blue eyes. The “Right-Wing” militia groups, we learn, are supported by powerful financiers and major political figures!

Harping on this same ridiculous theme of “*Fascism in the Service of Big Money*” is a characteristic of several other films.

In *The Inheritor*, by Philippe Labro (France, 1972), the hero (Jean-Paul Belmondo) returns to the USA to inherit an industrial empire. He discovers that his father had been murdered by his father-in-law, the director of an industrial group who is also the financier behind a “*neo-Fascist*” party. At least that’s what the director – (Jacques Lanzmann) would like to have us to believe...

In *A Billion Dollars* (France, 1981), a journalist discovers that GT1, a multinational corporation, worked for the Nazis. Since his boss refuses to continue the inquiry, the journalist goes into hiding and article is published by a small local newspaper. The big newspapers, of



course, are entirely controlled by “*fascists*”. The film is by Henri Verneuil (Achod Malakian), who was not a “*fascist*”... This is what is called “*accusatory inversion*”, i.e., “Freudian projection”.

## **Destroy the Local Elites**

“*Cosmopolitan*” propaganda is always aimed at destroying all local elites, whatever and wherever they are: encouraging the workers to revolt against their employers, the peasants against the lords. All authority is discredited, ancestral traditions are bespattered and ridiculed, and the “bourgeoisie” and “aristocrats” are always depicted in the darkest colours.

*The Dead Poets Society* was filmed in 1990. The film shows us an elite boarding school in the USA, an old and noble institution intended for the sons of high society. A literature professor upsets the lives of the students and dynamites the “dusty old values” of these “narrow-minded Christians”. This film, which invites us to reject traditions and norms, was directed by Peter Weir.

This is also the message of a film called *School Ties* by Robert Mandel (1992): The main character, “David Greene” joins one of the most prestigious preparatory schools in New England. His athletic and intellectual talents naturally make him the star of the institution in a few weeks. But to be accepted by his wealthy schoolmates, filled with anti-Semitic prejudice, and gain the love of a young girl from a good family, he is compelled to hide his Jewishness... until one day the truth explodes. At this moment, we understand that Christians are truly filthy people.

In the same genre, Marin Karmitz’s film, *Blow for Blow* (1971) is in the same genre: in a confectionary factory, the workers suffer intolerable and infernal working hours and conditions. A wildcat strike breaks out: the boss, kidnapped, humiliated and intimidated, is forced to capitulate. Like many of his fellow-Jews, Marin Karmitz made the transition from “*Far-Left*” to “*Hard*” “*Liberal Right*” early in the 21st century: the only problem now is how to “*consolidate*” the “*multiracial society*”.

The aggressiveness of cosmopolitan Jewish directors against the European world finds expression once again in *The Servant* (1963): a young English aristocrat, full of arrogance, hires a domestic servant in his service. The aristocrat quickly plunges into alcoholism and decadence, while the servant, highly dignified, comes to exercise an increasingly greater domination over his master. This tendency

systematically to gravitate towards “*inverted values*” is very typical of the Hebraic mentality. The film is by Joseph Losey, based on a screenplay by Harold Pinter (Nobel Prize for Literature in 2005), who succeeded his fellow-Jew Elfriede Jelinek.

The Middle Ages are always depicted in the darkest colours. We are told that the lords were always wicked and cruel: see *The War Lord* (USA, 1965). In the 11th century, the local lord notices a young peasant girl while out hunting. She is engaged to be married, and just as they are about to celebrate their nuptials, the lord enforces his *jus primae noctis* (an invention of French republicans in the 19th century). The film is by Franklin Schaffner.

The producer Rob Cohen manipulates the same story in his way in a “*multicultural*” sense in the film *Medieval* (USA, 2009): this is the story of a monk, a knight, a samurai, a Zulu, an Arab, a gypsy and a Viking – all in the Middle Ages!

The same contempt for traditional civilization may also be found in amusing cartoons, like *Shrek* (USA, 2001), set, once again. “Shrek” is a gentle, lovable ogre who lives in a remote forest. He confronts a dreadful dragon and rescues a beautiful princess. The king is a stubborn, ridiculous nabob (which is not in the European tradition at all) who wants to marry the princess, too, but Shrek, who has fallen in love with her, saves her from the coerced match in the cathedral in which the marriage is to be celebrated. The smashing of the stained glass window of the cathedral by the dragon, who forces his way inside, interrupting the forced nuptials, is supposed to be “*symbolic*”. Directed by Ted Elliott.

*The Truman Show* (USA, 1998) is a typical film: Truman is a man who is unaware that he only the unsuspecting star of a TV show. His surroundings are nothing but a set. All the people around him are actors, and he is the only one who doesn’t know it. The director’s intention was attack the *papier maché* society which serves as the stage set for Truman’s life: its hypocrisy, its false happiness. This hypocritical society is a WASP society in which there are no drugs, no delinquency, no porn. In escaping from this world which is “*closed, fragile, closed on itself*”, Truman experiences the joys of indiscriminate sex, drugs and ethnic chaos. One could hardly expect any different from the director of the *Dead Poets Society*, Peter Weir.

“*Cosmopolitan*” film makers do not just attack European culture alone. Wherever Jews settle, they set about to undermine, mock, ridicule and attack all local elites so as to replace them.

Here is a “Tamil” film: *A Donkey in the Brahmin Ghetto* (India, 1977). A donkey sneaks into a village enclave reserved for the superior

caste of Brahmins and is adopted as a mascot. The donkey induces miraculous visions in the priests, and the animal quickly becomes an object of veneration. This sarcastic film is signed “*John Abraham*”, no doubt a pure-blooded “*Tamil*”.

Or take a look at *Ankur* [“The Seedling”] (India, 1974): in an Indian village, a peasant woman, servant to a property owner, is seduced by her patron. The patron commits a number of serious crimes against the peasants with impunity, but revolt is brewing... Shyam Benegal, the director, is, of course, a “*Hindu*”.

Judaism, we see, is a dissolving force in all nations in which it is introduced. The Jews like to “*break down barriers*”, “*shatter taboos*”, as they themselves very often say. Nahum Goldman, the founder of the World Jewish Congress, wrote very explicitly, “*This is the way it is: Jews are revolutionaries for other peoples, but not for themselves*”.

## Anti-Christianity

Jewish worldwide cinema is also characterised by an anti-Christian messages. In television or at the cinema, Christians, and Catholics in particular, are most often depicted as bigots, narrow-minded and intolerant, even rapists and murderers. The Catholic clergy is regularly depicted as a haven for sadists and perverts of all stripes.

In *Crimson Rivers* (2003), a network of dangerous, terribly well organized, “neo-Nazis” has been detected. They set up their general headquarters in a monastery in Lorraine, linked by underground tunnels to the Maginot Line. The monks, who are fighting for a “*White Christian Europe*”, are in contact with highly placed European personages undermining the established order: they are everywhere, they own everything, but they are invisible. The film is signed Olivier Dahan.

Jean-Jacques Annaud’s beautiful film, *The Name of the Rose* (France, 1986), is taken from a novel by the world-famous Italian author Umberto Eco: the film is a crime drama set in a monastery in Northern Italy in the early 14th century. The film is littered with medieval clichés: all the monks, without exception, are abnormal. They grease their palms off the peasants who bring them their miserable harvests, while the peasants live in the filth and garbage tossed to them by the monks. The Catholic Church from top to bottom is just a perversion: the monks keep people in servitude and fear of the Devil, while jealously guarding the marvels contained in their Greek books which threaten to destabilise their power. Of course, it all ends up in

torture and the stake. The film was produced with the collaboration of Jacques Le Goff, an historian of the Marxist school. If anyone cares to take a non-Marxist glimpse at the magnificent epoch which was the Middle Ages, one should read the short book by Regine Permond entitled *Pour en Finir avec le Moyen Age* (“Finishing Off the Middle Ages”), (1977). Let us note that at no time during the entire film is there any question of a rose... The title is obviously intended for initiates in the *Kabbala*; in this regard, we note that the author of this tale, Umberto Eco, in 2005, also wrote the preface to a book entitled *Messianic Mystics*, in which he establishes a parallel between Hebraic messianism and Marxism.

Among Jewish American directors, anti-Christian hatred is expressed in the same manner. In *Seven* (1995), a Catholic sex pervert has undertaken to commit seven murders symbolizing his hatred of the seven capital sins: a film by David Fincher.

In *The Shawshank Redemption* (1994), the prison warden turns out to be the real villain; at the same time, of course, he is a very pious Christian. The film is signed Frank “Darabont”. In *The Favour, the Watch and the Very Big Fish* (1991), film maker Ben Lewin displays his disgust with Christianity.

In *The Last Temptation of Christ*, by Martin Scorsese (1998), Christ begins to dream of what his life could have been like with Mary Magdalene. We see Jesus make love to her. This film is an adaptation of a novel by Niko Kazantzakis.

In *Agnes of God*, by Norman Jewison (1985), *The Verdict*, by Sydney Lumet (1982), *Papillon*, by Franklin Schaffner (1973), *Elmer Gantry*, by Richard Brooks (1960), the Christian characters, priests and nuns, are regularly portrayed as villains.

Jewish film directors also appear to derive pleasure, in their films, from disrupting Catholic ceremonies. In the comedy *In and Out* (USA, 1997) for example, a marriage ceremony is taking place. At the very moment when they about to say “Yes” before the entire family and assembled congregation, the groom refuses, and announces in a low tone, with an air of resignation, that he is “gay”. Stupefaction. The ceremony breaks up in an uproar, and the couple quarrel violently in public. The film is directed by Frank Oz.

In *Shrek* (2001), the marriage ceremony is disrupted by a dragon who enters the church by smashing a stained glass window. In *Sacred Union*, by Alexander Arcady (France, 1989), a funeral is disrupted. In *A Very Curious Girl*, by Nelly Kaplan (1969), a Mass is disrupted.

The film *Hair* (USA, 1979) contains a sacrilegious scene set in a church: a group of long-haired hippies, high on acid, transform a

marriage ceremony into a Black Mass, complete with ecstatic dances, as if they were all possessed by the Devil. In actual fact, however, these contortions resemble the ceremonies of Hassidic Jews more than anything else. The film director is the “Czech” Milos Forman.

## **The Blacks Are Going to Save Humanity**

Science fiction stories are always an excuse to glorify the unification of humanity and the intermingling of all races. In *Independence Day* (USA, 1996), by Roland Emmerich, the planet, attacked by extra-terrestrials, is saved by a Black and a Jew.

In *The Fifth Element*, a film by Luc Besson (1997), the President of the United States is Black. In *Deep Impact* (USA, 1998), a gigantic asteroid is about to crash into the Earth. The planet is saved *in extremis* by the American President, who is Black. In *Bruce Almighty* (USA, 2003), a Black plays the role of God. The film was directed by Tom Shadyac, based on a screenplay by Steve Koren. David Palmer, President of the United States in the TV series *24*, is yet again played by a Black actor.

All this propaganda was no doubt intended to pave the way for the forthcoming election, by the American people, in November 2008, of the first Black President of the United States.

## **The Races Do Not Exist**

Now it is much easier to understand why so many “*scholars*” assure us that “*the races do not exist*”. The world famous author Primo Levi became the eulogist of race-mixing (for the *goyim* only, of course). In order to cause the acceptance of the idea more easily, he started with the postulate that we are all racial mixed: “*The Indo-European race is not pure, since nothing proves that it is*”.

In February 2001, the Minister of Research, Roger-Gerard Schwartzberg, stated: “*The races do not exist*”. The September 2001 of the *UNESCO Courier* (publication of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), contains lengthy claims in this sense: “*The human genome has been decoded at last. The endpoint of this project invalidates the myth of races. Genetic research has established that we all descend from one same common ancestor, born in Africa.*”

The famous geneticist, Axel Kahn, who was one of the organizers

of the World Congress “*against racial discrimination, xenophobia and intolerance*”, held in September 2001 at Durban, South Africa, confirmed: “*All men are in fact of a great genetic homogeneity, since their common ancestor is very young in terms of the evolution of life; he lived more than 200,000 years ago in Africa.*” You gotta believe it!

## Your Lying Eyes

In the film *Matrix*, by Larry Wachowski (USA, 1999), human beings are entirely controlled by a computer program which dominates all their thoughts and their entire lives. They think that they exist, but in fact they are nothing but the slaves of machines. There remains only one small nest of resistance: Zion! The film is cram-packed with cabalistic messages: the hero, Neo, is “*the Elect*”, the mythical liberator of humanity announced by the prophets, who will save “*Zion*”, as revealed by “*The Oracle*”. Human beings are depicted in the colours of a multi-racial society, while the “*Matrix*”, which intends to rule the universe, is represented by white men: three agents, led by one Agent Smith, who are, of course, very wicked, in their suits and ties. Once again, it is the whites who must bear responsibility for the real tyrants, since the matrix “*really exists*”; it’s the “*matrix*” that made this film.

*Men in Black* (USA, 1997) is a film which teaches us to welcome foreigners – all foreigners – even extra-terrestrials. We don’t know it yet, but there are already large numbers of them living among us; they have taken human shape. Members of a special governmental agency are responsible for regulating the flow of this “*new kind of immigrant*”, and to keep the existence of these extra-terrestrials secret so as to avoid alarming the population. Two super special agents, one Black and one White, are assigned to track down a hostile alien. The film was adapted by Barry Sonnenfeld from a screenplay by Ed Solomon. It was also produced by Steven Spielberg. All these directors and script writers are “*extra-terrestrials disguised as human beings*” and “*agents of the Matrix*”.

John Carpenter is the director of *They Live* (USA, 1988); the hero, Nada, thanks to special eye glasses, discovers that a small proportion of the population are composed of extra-terrestrials who look just like human beings. These aliens form an elite which governs the world through lies and corruption. These special eyeglasses also permit him to read subliminal messages on advertising panels, which order submission of all humans. They are everywhere, they own everything, you just can’t see it!

In *Raiders of the Lost Arc* (USA, 1980), by Steven Spielberg, we understand that the power of Yahweh is far too tremendous for us even to dream of resisting it.

### III

## The New World Order

“*World Democracy*”, “*World Citizenship*” and “*World Government*” are common expressions in cosmopolitan discourse. The expression “*New World Order*” was utilised for the first time by the American President George Bush in 1990, after the fall of the Soviet Union. The French President Nicolas Sarkozy used it in his speech before the General Assembly of the United Nations on 25 September 2007: “*In the name of France, I call upon all States to unite to found the new world order of the 21st century, on this powerful idea that the common goods of humanity must be placed under the responsibility of all of humanity*”. This is what permits us to conclude that the French President, Nicolas Sarkozy, is surely a hidden Jew, a “*crypto-Jew*”. His maternal origins are revealed by this one messianic statement, behind the facade of his Catholicism. George Bush was simply a “*synthetic*” Jew, who applied the program of his most influential advisors to the letter.

In 1945, the famous scientist, Albert Einstein, was one of the first major personalities in the modern world explicitly to demand the founding of a world government. This is perhaps one of the reasons why he is the object of such adulation, since his scientific aura has long since been seriously tarnished (cf. *Les Esperances Planetaires*, by myself, 2005).

In his *Dictionary of the 21st Century*, Jacques Attali is very explicit. According to him, the New World Order must be capable of exercising an “*implacable domination*” if necessary. “*An international peace organization*”, he says, “*will begin to be envisaged together with the initial discussions aimed at establishing a world government*”. Globalization will finally come to term: “*After the creation of European continental institutions, the urgent need for this type of world government will perhaps appear*”.

This type of declaration does not prevent Jewish intellectuals, as a whole, from sobbing and screaming vociferously the moment anyone even mentions the famous *Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion* – a “*forgery*”, according to them, but one which magnificently describes the contemporary world.



This idea is confirmed by the philosopher Emmanuel Levinas (*Difficult Freedom*, 1963), “*The very idea of a fraternal humanity, all united in the same destiny, is a Mosaic revelation*”.

Jewish intellectuals always insist on the notion that fulfilment of their philosophy of world unification is “*inevitable*”, as if the program had been appeared in a book of prophecies – except that we don’t know which one; Karl Marx Lenin, Trotsky, and the Bolshevik revolutionaries in 1917 all said the same things!

## **High Finance in the Service of Democracy**

Jewish financiers are the kings of Wall Street. Their undisputed financial supremacy is illustrated, for example, by an article in the 9 February 2006 edition of the newspaper *Le Point*, entitled “*Steven Cohen, the Boss of Wall Street*”. Steven Cohen, one reads, is the “*star of the Stock Market*”. He cultivates an aura of mystery and secrecy: The real “*Boss of Wall Street*” doesn’t even live in Manhattan, but rather, as a recluse in his house in Greenwich (Connecticut), surrounded by a wall four meters high. Steven Cohen, 49 years old, almost never appears in public... In 2005, he pocketed 500 million dollars! His secret: he knows everything before anybody else. His eyes riveted on his computer screens, he analyzes thousands of bits of data, throwing tantrums when the analysts of Wall Street don’t give him the most accurate information. Investors who entrust their money to him (4 billion dollars) pay dearly to do so: Cohen takes 3% of all capital in management fees (as against 1.44% on average charged by other funds), plus 3.5% of the profits (compared to 19.2% on average charged by other funds). Cohen “*believes in total capitalism*”: “*You eat what you kill*”, he tells his traders, who are rewarded according to performance.

The famous George Soros, a Jewish speculator of Hungarian origin, was also a star of Wall Street. He is one of the richest men in the world, and the symbol of international speculation. His personal fortune is estimated at 70 billion dollars. In 1992 he rose to the pinnacle of his glory by successfully pulling off one of the greatest financial coups of the century. In a few days, sensing the weakness of the British pound, he mobilised some ten billion dollars against the pound sterling. The Bank of England vacillated before his speculative assaults, and was finally compelled to devalue and withdraw the pound from the European monetary system. Soros became “The Man who Broke the Bank of England”, pocketing more than a billion dollars in a week.

George Soros is also a “*philanthropist*”. The Soros foundation “*for an open society*” teaches “*tolerance*” and the “*democratic values*” of an “*open society*”. The billionaire finances cultural and scientific projects, and subsidises “*the independent and democratic press*”. In his last book, published in 2006 (*The Great World Disorder*), the speculator unveils a few bits of information on his role in the various recent “*democratic*” revolutions: the “Pink Revolution” in Georgia, in 2003; the “Orange Revolution”, in the Ukraine, in 2004; as well as in the bombardments of little nationalist Serbia.

In 1999, the person responsible for the mass bombing of Serbia was none other than Madeleine K. “Albright”, who had been propelled into the State Department by Bill Clinton. “Albright” was in fact the family name of a husband whom she divorced, while the “K” referred to Korbel, a Jewish family from Czechoslovakia. At the Ministry of Defense, there was William Cohen, while a certain Samuel Berger occupied the strategic position of Head of National Security, etc.

Soros also took a position in favour of a military intervention against the Taliban in Afghanistan in 2001, for professing an “*obscurantist*” religion: “I supported the invasion of Afghanistan, Ben Laden’s country of residence and the location of the Al-Qaeda training camps”.

Soros, who is – naturally – very much concerned about “*European*” interests, is naturally the apostle of mass immigration and the entry of Turkey into the European Union: “*With an aging population, immigration is an economic necessity*”, he writes. “*As the prototype of open world societies, Europe must welcome immigration and the adhesion of new members*”.

It should furthermore be noted at this point that in 2010, the President of the IMF was a Zionist named Dominique Strauss-Kahn; and that the President of the World Bank is one of his fellow Jews, Robert Zoellick. The Federal Reserve Board, which contributed largely to the “*sub-prime*” crisis through its lax monetary policies, thus triggering a financial crash, was directed by the Jew Alan Greenspan until 2006, before being relieved by another Jew, Ben Bernanke.

Here is the consortium of the eight private banks which own the Fed, the central bank of the United States. Rotschild, Lazard Brothers, Israel Moses Seaf, Kuhn, Loeb & Co., Warburg, Lehman Brothers, Goldman Sachs, Rockefeller. As for the Rockefellers, who pretend to be descended from Puritan Protestants, they are simply what is known as “synthetic Jews”.

In 2007, a study published by *Vanity Fair*, a large American magazine, shows that of the one hundred richest people in the country,

more than half were Jews. Since they are very well organized and stick together, and since they own all the communications media, their influence over each and every government – one after the other – is incomparably greater than anyone else's. There are poor Jews, of course, but it remains true nonetheless that Jews are greatly over-represented among the Earth's billionaires.

An article in the 26 February 2008 issue of the *Jerusalem Post* informs us that the Jews are "*the wealthiest religious group in the USA*", with 46% of them earning six-figure annual incomes, while only 18% of all other Americans earned that much. None of these considerations has ever deterred Jewish intellectuals from regularly complaining of "*the odious prejudices of an earlier time*".

## War Against Islam

The Western news media regularly accuse Christians for the role they may have played in triggering the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. But the Christians are only "*scapegoats*" here, since the people most highly responsible were obviously the Zionists, who are so influential in all American governments and in the media.

Ardent war-mongers like Elie Wiesel never hesitate to drape themselves in the great ideals of "*peace and love*" so as better to advocate war against Iraq in 1991: "*It is not simply a question of helping Kuwait*", he said at the time, "*it is a question of protecting the entire Arab world*". All Westerners were therefore to mobilize themselves against the "Butcher of Baghdad". "*Against war, it is imperative to make war. Against the destructive force which it employs against humanity, it is necessary to oppose an even greater force so that humanity may live. It is a question of the security of the entire civilized world, of its right to peace, and not just the future of Israel... Thirst for vengeance? No: thirst for justice. And peace.*"

The Jewish lobby has been extremely powerful in all American governments for many decades. Many Jews – most of them former Left-wingers, having recently converted to "*Neo-Conservatism*" – were very powerful in the government of George W. Bush: Paul Wolfowitz was Secretary of State for Defense, after which he was appointed to the position of head of the World Bank. Richard Perle headed the management office of the Pentagon; Douglas Feith was the Vice-Secretary of Defense; Michael Rubin was in charge of Iran-Iraq, etc.

*The Jerusalem Post* of 25 April 2006 gloated: "*After appointing*

*Joshua Bolten secretary general of the White House, President George Bush has chosen another Jew, Joel Kaplan, as Bolten's adjutant*". He also appointed other Jews as collaborators, such as the Secretary of State for the Interior Michael Chertoff, the Adjutant Security Advisor Elliott Abrams and the pillar of the White House, Jay Lefkowitz, etc.

In issue number 1 of *The Weekly Standard* of 1 October 2001, Zionists Robert Kagan and William Kristol demanded action aimed at "regime change" in Iraq as soon as the Taliban in Afghanistan were defeated. The manipulation of information led the public to believe that Saddam Hussein, the "new Hitler", constituted a terrible threat.

As soon as the problem of Iraq was settled and Iranian President Ahmadinejad came to be known as the spokesman for world resistance to the globalist empire, the war-mongering of numerous Jewish intellectuals was once again obvious. In France, Bernard-Henri Levy and his fellow Jews denounced the "Islamofascists of Teheran".

Minister Bernard Kouchner, apostle of the "right of intervention", the dream of sending French soldiers to fight once again to defend Israeli interests. "Bringing democracy", they call it – just another example of Westerners going to war against the "enemies of civilization" and "humanity".

Israel, in fact, almost never fights its war except with other people's blood.

Policy objectives are constantly inverted by obvious media propaganda. The famous American writer Norman Mailer, for example, assured us, in his book *Why We Are at War* (2003), that the only persons responsible for American imperialism were the Neo-con Christians. "Upon the fall of the Soviet Union, the chauvinist conservatives saw their chance to rule the world..." A perfect example of Freudian projection and a complete inversion of the truth.

Hollywood is naturally responsible for planetary propaganda. In the 1980s and 90s alone, we counted at least thirty films showing Arabs attempting to reduce the "free" world to servitude.

In *Rules of Engagement* by William Friedkin (USA, 2000), the American ambassador to Yemen is threatened by a crowd manipulated by Moslems. The latter are so contemptible that the audience applauds when American marines begin to massacre them.

*Holy Union* by Alexandre Arcady (1989) is pure caricature. The wicked Moslems who threaten democracy are depicted as ferocious animals. All French girls are depicted as seem destined to mate with Jews and Arabs.

Again, in the same genre, we have: *Curfew* by Edward Zwick (USA, 1998), *Delta Force*, by Menahem Golan, (USA, 1986), *Return*

*to the Future*, by Robert Zemeckis (USA, 1985), *Black Sunday*, by John Frankenheimer (USA, 1977), etc.

In *Network* (USA, 1976), we understand that the Arabs and their petro-dollars are purchasing America wholesale. An announcer calls upon TV viewers to revolt. This film, by Sydney Lumet, is an accusatory projection.

Since the second Intifada, in September 2000, and the incidents exploding in the French “*suburbs*” (immigrant slums), the Jews realized that the danger, for them, was no longer a question of “*Extreme Right wingers*”, but, rather, from Islam and young Afro-Maghrebin immigrants. This is what made many Jewish intellectuals rally to the “*hard*”, “*liberal*”, “*pro-American*” right: Andre Glucksmann, Alexandre Adler, Marc Weitzmann, Pascal Bruckner, Romain Goupil, Alain Finkielkraut, and the “Peruvian” novelist Mario Vargas Llosa, pursuing their objectives in a slightly different way: the problem now of “*consolidating our multicultural society*” which the Jews have worked so hard to create, but which now threatens to come apart at the seams.

## Wars of Liberation

When the USSR entered the war against Nazi Germany in June 1941, all Jews, all over the world, were hysterical for joy. This is what Elie Wiesel had to say, through the persona of his protagonist, in his *Testament of a Murdered Jewish Poet*: “*I welcome the opening of hostilities with open relief. I was not the only one. Listening to Molotov’s speech, I felt a powerful, immoderate, desire to shout for joy: Hurray! We were finally going to do battle against Hitler and the Hitlerites! Hurray! We are going to be able to give free reign to our anger... I would like to with my own people, in the midst of my own people, to congratulate them, to kiss them, to cry for joy like them, to cry for pride, to laugh with them, to sing like them, while emptying a few glasses...*”

And Wiesel continues: “*No war in history had been welcomed with so much passion and fervour. Ready to offer ourselves, to do anything to vanquish the worst enemies of our people and of humanity*”.

At this point, we are reminded of a Roman Polanski film called *The Pianist* (2001), in which a Polish Jewish family from Warsaw are reunited around an underground radio set, exploding with joy at the announcement of the French and British entry into the war: “*Wonderful!*”

In the film by Ariel Zeitoun, *Navel of the World* (1993), we once again see Tunisian Jews delirious with joy at the announcement of the French declaration of war against Germany.

The “*pacifist*” Albert Einstein was transmogrified into a furious war-monger in 1933, following the accession of Hitler to power. The English, French and Americans were supposed to go off and fight to save “Democracy”. The Jews, as we see, are always working to establish “*Permanent World Peace*”.

Everything here is a question of vocabulary. Everybody is for “*peace*”. After crushing their enemies, everybody is for “*peace*”.

## IV

# Historical Traumas

### The Trauma of the “Shoah”

After the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem by the Romans, the massacres and forced conversions of the First Crusade, their expulsion from Spain (and every other country in Europe), the pogroms of the Cossacks, etc, the misfortunes of the Second World War enabled the Jews to suffer a new “*trauma*”, universally conveyed, naturally, by means of their control of the media, a “*trauma*” which they generously offer to share with us for the benefit of all of humanity. Relayed by TV and film, the continuing crisis of suffering and deafening lamentations has finally brought humanity on its knees, bewildered by so much hysteria.

Nevertheless, faced with certain extraordinary testimonies, a logical person can sometimes feel he has the right to ask whether these are not just Hollywood scenarios.

We find for example, a few terrifying anecdotes from the work of the famous Nazi hunter, Simon Wiesenthal. First, there is “Tom Mix”, “*whose favourite pastime was to ride through the camp on horseback and shoot and random at the prisoners*”. And here we have the SS killing baby Jews by “*throwing them against a wall*”. And how about this: “*Babies were thrown in the air like packages*”. “*I personally*”, writes Wiesenthal, “*took the testimony of a man who had seen Mengele throw a living baby into the flames. Another witness said that one day, Mengele killed a 14-year old girl by stabbing her with a bayonet*”. The following is an example of the horrors of which Dr. Mengele was capable: “*Mengele sacrificed thousands of twins taken all over Europe, giving them painful injections to try to change the colour of their eyes*” (*The Murderers Among Us*, 1967).

Martin Gray, in *For Those I Loved*, says that, he removed the bodies from the gas chamber at Auschwitz immediately after the gassings, without even a gas mask, while the highly toxic hydrocyanic acid still impregnated the clothing and bodies of the victims: “*Among the warm bodies, we found still-living infants. Just children, huddled against the bodies of their mothers. And we strangled them with our*

*bare hands, before throwing them into the pit: and we risked our lives doing that, since we were wasting time... The butchers wanted everything to happen quickly.” One of his comrades had seen “the Germans set fire to what had been a hospital in the ghetto, he saw them fracture the skulls of new-born babies against the walls, slit open the bellies of pregnant women, throw the sick into the flames. He saw it”.*

Wladyslaw Szpilman also left a poignant testimony. His book, entitled *The Pianist*, published in 1946, tells the extraordinary story of a Jewish musician in the Warsaw ghetto. With his own eyes, he described how he saw the bodies of young girls: “*They had been murdered according a method which was dear to the hearts of the Nazi occupants: held by the legs and thrown head first against the bricks*”.

Elie Wiesel, in *Night* (1958), tells of his sojourn at Auschwitz between April 1944 and January 1945. In the original first edition, he never mentioned any “*gas chambers*”, which only appeared in the German version, *Die Nacht zu Begraben, Elischa*. Every time the word “*crematorium*” appeared in the original, the translator, Meyer-Clason, translated it as “*gas chamber*”.

In the absence of any “*gas chambers*”, Wiesel saw what nobody else ever saw: “*Not far from us, flames, huge flames, were rising from a ditch. Something was being burned there. A truck drew close and unloaded its hold. Small children. Babies! Yes, I did see this, with my own eyes... children in the flames.*”

What Elie Wiesel saw is simply unheard-of. But what he heard is perhaps more so. In *Against Silence* (1985), he describes the massacres at Babi-Yar, in the Ukraine, where the Germans executed Soviet citizens, including numerous Jews: “*Later, I heard from a witness that, during months and months, the ground never stopped trembling; and that, from time to time, geysers of blood had squirted forth*”. You gotta believe it!

In the April 2003 issue of *Israel* magazine, Fredric Sroussi wrote in all seriousness: “*The Latvian Waffen SS officer Herberts Cirkurs made a ‘hobby’ of throwing babies into the air and shooting them in the head, like a ball-trap.*” Later on, we will see the reason for this obsession with babies and young children.

Edmond Fleg (Flegenheimer), in his book *Why I Am a Jew* also spoke of these atrocities: “*These eviscerated women, old men buried alive, children thrown naked into the flames. I wanted to rise up and cry with all my heart, cry the martyrdom to the whole universe*”. This quotation may be found on page 45 of his book... which was published in 1928... that is, eleven years before the beginning of a Second World War!



Simon Wiesenthal also claims that the Germans transformed the Jews into bars of soap: *"The crates bore the initials RIF – Rein jüdisches Fett... It was in the General Government and the factory was in Galicia, at Belzec. Nine hundred thousand Jews were utilised as the raw material in this factory, from April 1942 until May 1943."* But, curiously, no historian has dared mentioned the *"Jewish human soap"* on TV and other *"lampshades of human skin"* since the end of the 1980s.

The Treblinka survivor Yankiel Wiernik proposes other surprising details: *"They soaked the bodies with gasoline. This cost considerable sums of money, and the result was not satisfactory: the male bodies simply did not burn... When they incinerate the bodies of pregnant women, their bellies exploded and one could see the embryos catch fire in the bellies of their mothers... The gangsters kept close to the ashes and were shaken by spasms of laughter. Their faces radiated a truly diabolical joy"*.

Happily, *"survivors"* coming back alive from the *"death camps"* are innumerable. Let us listen once again to Simon Wiesenthal, who wrote, after the liberation of the camps: *"The survivors spread over through Europe in an immense measureless tide. People hitch-hiked, stopped jeeps for the short journeys or clung to carriages on the demolished railways, without windows or doors. Some took a seat in the overflowing hay carts, other started off on foot."*

Nahum Goldmann, as President of the World Jewish Congress, conducted negotiations with Germany to estimate the amount of reparations to be paid to the Jews. *"In 1945"*, he writes, *"there were almost six hundred thousand Jews, survivors of the German concentration camps, whom no country wanted to accept."* We are therefore fully entitled to ask whether these *"extermination camps"* were really *"extermination camps"* at all.

## **The Whole World is Guilty**

Whenever one speaks of the Jews, it's about their sufferings that one thinks of first of all. The Jews themselves, in fact, present their history as an *"uninterrupted vale of tears"*, without ever explaining the reasons for anti-Semitism. In *The Difficult Good Fortune of Being a Jew* (1978), Andre Neher recalls the phrase used by the philosopher Jankelevitch: *"Auschwitz is the failure of the thousand-year old adventure of human thought"*. In reality, Auschwitz was, above all else, a hard blow for Jewish thought.

The whole world, in any case, is guilty, and must expiate its crimes for what happened during the Second World War. All of humanity is guilty. It is a recurrent theme. It is what Elie Wiesel is so eager to tell us: “*The world knew, and kept silent... Moscow and Washington were informed of what the killers were doing in the death camps. Why was nothing done at least to slow down their ‘production’? That no military airplane attempted to destroy the railways around Auschwitz remains for me a scandalous enigma. At the time, Birkenau ‘processed’ ten thousand Jews per day [at least! –Editor’s note]... But whether or not the Jews lived or died, whether they disappeared today or tomorrow, the free world were indifferent*”. The Allies were therefore “*complicit*”.

Martin Gray, in *For Those I Loved*, also reveals this same tendency to cast guilt on others: “*The whole world allowed us to die... The whole world allowed us to be murdered*”.

Note that the near totality of anti-Nazi films on the concentration camps during the Second World War were produced by Jewish filmmakers: *Sarah’s Key* (2010), was directed by Gilles Pacquet-Brenner. In the film *Amen*, (France, 2002), the actor Matthieu-Kassovitz plays the role of a young Jesuit who, during the Second World War, attempts to awaken the Vatican from its torpor and incite Pope Pius XII publicly to denounce Nazi barbarism. The director, Constantin Costa-Gavras, interpreted the story in his usual style. In the same genre, Costa-Gavras also directed *Music Box* (USA, 1989).

*The Pianist* (2001) was directed by Roman Polanski; the film is full of summary executions and atrocities. *Lucie Aubrac* by Claude “Berri” (1997), is a film about the glory of the Jewish resistance member Lucie “Aubrac”. The Germans are as cruel as usual. *Life is Beautiful* (1997) was directed by Roberto Benigni. *Schindler’s List* (USA, 1994) tells the story of a German industrialist who saves deported Jews by employing them in his factory. Here again, the savagery of the Germans is in contrast to the weakness and innocence of the Jews. It is a Stephen Spielberg film.

In *Au Revoir, Les Enfants* (France, 1987), the story takes place in 1944 in a religious boarding school in the Parisian suburbs. A kitchen boy reports to the police concerning Jewish boys hidden in the school. The bourgeois French are depicted here as hypocritical, bigoted villains. The director, Louis Malle, was nevertheless also a son of the *grande bourgeoisie*; but a Jew. Louis Malle’s father was the director of a red beet sugar factory owned by his wife’s family; the Beghin family. His film won a Golden Lion award at the Festival of Venice in 1987.

*The Boys from Brazil* (USA, 1978), tells the story of a Nazi hunter in the 1970s who discovers a plot in Uruguay. The horrible Dr.

Mengele, former torture-doctor at Auschwitz, is at the head of this diabolical conspiracy. He lives in a luxurious villa which is sufficiently well isolated to permit him to continue his perverse activities on genetics, and to reign over a troop of abject servants reduced to the status of slaves; this is the symbol of the White Man in all his arrogance. The film is by Franklin Schaffner.

Let us mention *Marathon Man* (USA, 1976): a Nazi criminal takes refuge in Uruguay and later travels to New York to negotiate a diamond deal (the diamond industry is typically “Nazi”, as everyone knows). We recall a scene in which the Nazi tortures a Jew on a dentist’s chair (there are a lot of Nazi dentists, you know). The film is by John Schlesinger. One might also mention *The Old Gun*, aka *Vengeance One by One* by Roberto Enrico (France, 1975), in which German soldiers are unspeakably cruel.

In this third millennium, “*Shoah education*” becomes the new religion, and humanity is invited to genuflect before the People-Priest.

We also know that in Jewish eschatology, the day of the Redemption and the arrival of the Messiah must be preceded by great wars and catastrophes, which will be accompanied by great sufferings for the Jewish “people”. The Jews always use the same expression here: “*the child-birthing pains of the Messiah*”, they say. The Shoah, according to them, is therefore sent to confirm their “election”.

## The Spirit of Vengeance

These indescribable sufferings do not therefore invalidate the mission of the Jews on earth. Quite the contrary. They confirm the unique destiny of the Jewish people and their universal vocation. Nahum Goldmann writes: “*The Jewish people have always believed in its superiority (expressed in the classical phrase ‘The Chosen People’)*”.

The famous Austrian Jewish writer Joseph Roth has expressed this absolute faith in the destiny of Israel (*The Wandering Jews*, 1927). “*The pride of a man who knows that one day he will win... The contempt that the Eastern Jew feels for the unbeliever is a thousand times greater than any that is directed at him*”, (p. 30).

The Jews are little inclined to forgiveness and always intend to revenge themselves in one way or another. This, again, is a recurrent theme of Jewish literature, as the Palestinians have occasion to experience every day. The famous Shylock, in the Shakespeare play, incarnates these sanguinary instincts perfectly.

In the American and Soviet POW camps, after the war, German

prisoners had ample occasion to experience the same thing as well. In 2009, the American director Quentin Tarantino left us a testimony in *Inglorious Basterds*: during the war, in Germany, a commando of Jews mercilessly liquidates Germans by stabbing them or beating them to death with baseball bats. Note that in one scene, at the end of the film, the beautiful blonde starlet falls into the arms of the projectionist, a Negro: this is a veritable obsession among the Jews. Tarantino's film gives us a merely the slightest glimpse of what may well have occurred in the POW camps at the end of the war. Let us not forget that hundreds of thousands of German prisoners never returned from Allied prisoner of war camps – something the media never mention. In Hebrew, this is summarised in the formula *Laassoth nekama bagoim*: “Revenge yourselves upon the Gentiles”. The humiliation of the enemy then precedes the final victory.

## Communism under Lenin

Many Jews played a considerable role in the Bolshevik revolution of October 1917. The aim of the revolution was not just the abolition of private property and the creation of a collective system, but rather, to “liberate” all of humanity – erasing tradition, religion, nationalities and all tradition, destroying all differences between men, so as to enable a perfect world to arise and flourish. It was necessary to “*erase the past*”, so that a “*new man*” might appear. In reality, the egalitarian fanaticism of Communism led immediately to a series of massacres. In total, over thirty million Russians and Ukrainians were liquidated by the criminal folly of their new masters in only thirty years. After the Maoist experiment in China, the Russian Revolution was, therefore, the second greatest tragedy in human history.

But where it is permitted, in the democratic countries, to denounce the horrors of Communism at the beginning of the 21st century, insisting upon the identity of its principal instigators is quite a different matter. Nevertheless, we know that Communism was a Jewish creation: Karl Marx was the grandson of rabbis; Lenin also had Jewish origins on his mother's side; Trotsky, the head of the Red Army, was really named Bronstein; Kamenev, President of the Soviet of Moscow, was really named Rosenfeld; Zinoviev, the master of Leningrad, was named Apfelbaum; the first president of the Soviet Union was a Jew named Sverdlov; Karl Radek, the spokesman for Moscow in foreign countries, was named Sobelsohn, etc.

On 27 July 1918, just after the execution of the Imperial family, a

special law on anti-Semitism was promulgated, the conclusion of which was written by Lenin personally: “*The Sovnarkom enjoins all its Soviet deputations to eradicate anti-Semitism. The authors of pogroms, those who propagate them, are declared outside the law*”. And at this time, placing anti-Semites “*outside the law*” meant shooting them purely and simply.

The Cheka, or Extraordinary Commission, instituted the Red Terror as soon as it was created, in September 1917, and pursued it until well after the Civil War. Starting in January 1918, “*the death penalty, on the spot, without judgment and or instruction*” was the rule. Then came the thousands of police raids in which thousands of perfectly innocent people were abducted and shot during the night or drowned in the rivers by the barge load. The Cheka became the principal nerve centre of the direction of the State.

The lists of prominent Jewish dignitaries under the Bolshevik regime is endless. The revolution that broke out in Berlin in 1918 was led by other Jews: Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxembourg. In Hungary, at the same time, Bela Kun took over as head of a revolutionary government which was composed almost exclusively of Jews. The triumph of Bela Kun encouraged the leftists of Bavaria. At Munich, the revolution had as its spiritual head a Jew named Kurt Eisner, who was himself replaced by an anarchist Jew named Ernst Toller. Then, the Red intellectuals took power, with Eugen Levine at their head, son of a Jewish merchant and a native of St. Petersburg.

Jewish historians always forget to mention the role of their fellow Jews in the atrocities which took place in Russia between 1917 and 1947. The truth nevertheless compels us to point out that the Jewish doctrinaires, Jewish functionaries and Jewish torturers bear a very great responsibility for the destruction of the churches, the pitiless repression against the population and the innumerable massacres which were committed at that time by the forces of the Soviet political police.

## **Communism under Stalin**

The famous author Alexander Solzhenitsyn, after many others, has shown the implication of this community in his book entitled *Two Centuries Together* (2002). Stephane Courtois, the author of the famous *Black Book of Communism*, writes in the preface to the book by Arkady Vaksberg (*Stalin and the Jews*, 2003): “*Great numbers of Jews gravitated into the spheres of power, to the point that in 1936, nearly 40% of the high cadres of the political police were Jews. And two of the*

men closest to Stalin, 'the little father of the peoples', Kaganovich and Mekhlis, were Jews". The higher one ascended in the hierarchy, the greater the proportion of Jews one found.

At the beginning of the 1930s, the Soviet Union was directed by a triumvirate consisting of Stalin, Molotov and Kaganovich. Molotov, the number two minister in the regime after Stalin, married a Jewess named Polina Karpovskaya, who was a director with full responsibilities and a true Bolshevik.

At this time, the regime planned a famine to liquidate the Ukrainian peasants. The number of deaths resulting from the famine of 1932 amounted to between four and five million, but could be on the order of ten million", writes the Jewish historian Simon Sebag Montefiore (*"Stalin, the Court of the Red Tsar"*, 2003). Fifteen million people were deported, and large numbers of them died during the collectivization. Cases of cannibalism were reported in the Ukraine and the Urals.

Lazar Kaganovich was the youngest of five brothers, three of whom were important Bolsheviks. It was he who put together the mechanisms of what became known as "*Stalinism*". Lazar, the "*Man of Iron*", was in charge of the administration of Central Asia before becoming the "*Scourge of the Ukraine*", which he directed in the 1920s, before returning to Moscow in 1928 and becoming a member of the Politburo in 1930. He crushed peasant revolts from the north of the Caucasus to Western Siberia. He succeeded Molotov as First Secretary of Moscow and undertook to create a Bolshevik metropolis by dynamiting historical buildings and churches with the enthusiasm of a born vandal. After Stalin's death, Lazar Kaganovich was never prosecuted for his participation in the extermination of the peasants, and died peacefully in his comfortable apartment in Moscow in 1991, at the age of 88.

Genrikh (Enoch) Yagoda, the head of the secret police, was another symbolic personage of the Stalinist regime. Half-bald, of short stature, but driven by pitiless ambition, Yagoda, a specialist in the art of poisoning people, was the son of a Jewish jeweller from Nizhny Novgorod. He frequented the house of Gorki, the President of the Writers' Union. His great achievement, with Stalin's support, was the creation of the vast economic empire of the gulags, with the use of slave labour. In the years 1931-32, the famous gulag of the "*White Sea-Baltic Canal*" project engulfed hundreds of thousands of Russian and Ukrainian peasants. The great writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn relates that a newspaper edition dated August 1933 and dedicated to the completion of the canal, published a list of the award-winning recipients: modest medals for cement workers and carpenters; supreme medals – The Order of Lenin! – for six persons whose large-scale

portrait individual photographs were published in large format. At the head of the collective, there stood Genrikh Yagoda, commissar of the NKVD; Matvei Berman, head of the gulag; Semyon Firin, head of the Belbaltlag camp; Lazar Kogan, head of construction; Yakov Rappoport, second head of construction; Naftaly Frenkel, head of the White Sea work site (and the evil genius of entire archipelago). And here, forty years later, Solzhenitsyn reproduced the portraits of these “Six Rascals” in his book *The Gulag Archipelago*: “They criticized me for having reproduced the portraits of the heads of the worksite of the famous White Sea-Baltic canal, and they accused me of selecting Jews. But I didn’t select anyone: I reproduced the photos of all the camp directors appearing in compilation published in 1936. Whose fault is it if they were all Jews? I took them as they were, without selecting anything, but the whole world was indignant. Anti-Semitism! And where were they when these same portraits were published in 1933 for the first time? Why didn’t they express their indignation then?”

In 1934, the GPU metamorphosed into the NKVD (People’s Commissariat of Interior Affairs) with Yagoda at the head. Slutsky was at the head of the foreign department of the NKVD; he directed the espionage services. His adjutants were Boris Berman and Sergey Mikhailovich Shpigelglas. Once again, Yagoda supervised the first of the great Moscow show trials in the summer of 1936. Eleven of the sixteen defendants were Jews, but that only reflected their major presence among the old generation of Bolsheviks, whom Stalin had undertaken to liquidate. Genrikh Yagoda is, any case, the biggest criminal of the 20th century, since he was responsible for at least 10 million deaths.

Lev Mekhlis was one of Stalin’s most loyal lieutenants. “Even Stalin called him a fanatic”, writes Simon Sebag Montefiore. With his halo of black hair and his pointed, bird-like face, Mekhlis, in his way, played as important a role as Molotov or Beria. Born at Odessa of Jewish parents in 1889, he left school at fourteen, and only joined the Bolsheviks in 1918. Appointed by the sole commissar in the Crimea, he distinguished himself for his cruelty during the civil war by executing thousands of adversaries. He became one of Stalin’s assistants and the confidante of all his secrets, working with a sick frenzy. In 1930, Stalin appointed him editor in chief of *Pravda*. Mekhlis was then promoted adjutant commissar for Defense and Head of the political administration of the Red Army.

In the years 1920 and 1930, many Russian members of the Central Committee and even of the *Politburo* had Jewish wives: Molotov (Polina Karpovskaya), Voroshilov (Gold Grobman), Bukharin (Esther

Gourvitsch, then Anna Lourie). Stalin's faithful cabinet director, Alexander Poskrebyshev, married a certain Bronislava Weintraub, a Lithuanian Jewess from an industrialist family who made a fortune in the sugar trade.

In September 1936, Nikolai Yezhov replaced Yagoda as the head of the secret police services and quickly became the most powerful man in the USSR after Stalin. He was one of Kaganovich's protégés. Nikolai Yezhov was one of the greatest monsters in history. He it was, in fact, who, between 1936 and 1938, became the principal organizer of the Great Terror directed against party members and the "*People of the Past*": aristocrats, priests, bourgeois, peasants, who had until then escaped the class terror. In fourteen months, more than seven hundred thousand persons were shot and millions of others were deported. Son of a forestry guard and a servant - this Russian - was a small, highly nervous man, thin and scrawny, measuring one meter fifty-one. Friend of the Jewish poet Mandelstam, he married a Jewess named Eugenia Feigenberg as his second wife. His wife's best friend was "Bronka", the wife of Poskrebyshev, Stalin's cabinet director. The balance sheet of the Cheka's victims amounts, pre-war, to at least twenty million deaths.

After his appointment to the post of People's Commissar for the Interior, Nikolai Yezhov chose Matvei Berman as first adjutant. The latter kept his post at the head of the gulag at the same time. Another Jew, Mikhail Litvinov became the service head of the cadres of the NKVD. Isaac Shapiro, another loyal collaborator, was placed at the head of the secretariat of the NKVD. In December 1936, we find seven Jews among the ten departments of the glorious service of the GUGB of the NKVD (Secret Political Department).

Jewish artists were then praised to the skies by the regime. They regrouped around the writer Mikhoels. Isaac Babel rapidly became one of the most popular authors, with Boris Pasternak, Osip Mandelstam, Ilya Ehrenburg and Vassili Grossman. The hard core of Soviet cinema also consisted of Jews: Eisenstein, Dziga Vertov (Kaufman), Grigori Kozintsev, Leonid Trauberg, Grigori Roshal, etc.

We know that, after 1945, Jews were placed at the head of governments in Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania. Matthieu Rakosi, who directed Hungary until 1953, was really named Matthieu Roth. He was the son of a Jewish grocer, and was "one of the most pitiless despots of the 20th century", writes David Irving. The four men who held real power in popular Hungary were all Jews. Besides Rakosi, the Jewish quartet consisted of Ernest Gero, who directed the economy of the country. Born Ernest Singer, it was he who charged Ramon Mercader with the assassination of Leon Trotsky in 1940. Michel



Farkas was responsible for the army and defense. Born Wolf, he was an NKVD officer at Moscow and a former member of the International Brigades in Spain, like Gero. Joseph Reval, in turn, was appointed to run the nation's culture. He was also the regime's minister of propaganda.

The situation was equivalent in Rumania, where Ana Pauker established a fierce dictatorship. It was she who oversaw the first political trials from 1947 to 1949. During the period from 1950-52, she supported Stalin's project for the "*canal of death*": thousands of prisoners were compelled to work under inhuman conditions to construct a canal linking the Danube to the Black Sea. This was a veritable gulag in which 120,000 people died in two years. The historian Stephane Courteois mentions the case of Col. Nicolski, famous for his cruelty: "*His real name was Grunberg. He was a KGB agent in Rumania. In 1948 he became the adjutant director of the sinister Securitate – the political police – personally responsible for thousands of murders, inventor of the terrifying "reeducation" experiment at the prison at Pitesti, Nicolski died peacefully, in his superb villa at Bucharest, on 16 April 1992.*"

Stalin's "anti-Zionist" swing took place in 1948, after the creation of the State of Israel, supported principally by the United States. The Jews were then gradually evicted from the higher spheres of Soviet power. The process accelerated in 1952, with the "Doctors" trial, the dictator's (enigmatic) death in 1953. Khrushchev had Beria executed, and the regime maintained its "anti-Zionist" line until the end.

it was inevitable that the USSR and the Communist states of Central Europe would be denounced by the Jews of the West. In *The Confession* (France, 1970), for example, Constantin Costa-Gavras shows the endless interrogations to which an "*innocent*" Zionist was subjected, at Prague, in 1951. The Jews, as we all know, are never guilty of anything; rather, they are always innocent.

## May 1968

In 1968, we find the same individuals, animated by the same messianic faith. Of the four principal leaders of the events of May 1968, Daniel Cohn-Bendit, Alain Krivine, Alain Greismar and Jacques Suveageot, the first three were Jews.

At the Revolutionary Communist League, in the 1970s, the situation was summed up in a joke: "Why don't they speak Yiddish at the political bureau of the Communist League? Because Ben-said is a

Sephardic Jew.” In fact, Daniel Ben-said, a native of North Africa (and a Sephardic Jew), did not understand the Yiddish spoken by the other Trotskyite leaders, who were Ashkenazi Jews, natives of Eastern Europe.

An Israeli historian, Yair Auron, who published a book on this subject entitled *Extreme-Leftist Jews in May 1968*, confirmed this remark: “*Of the twelve members of the political bureau of the League and its beginnings, ten others were Jews from Eastern Europe; there was one single non-Jew, and then there was Ben-said*”.

Some people talked of a “*shabbos goy*”, that is, a goy employed to do minor jobs on the Sabbath, responsible for opening the doors and pushing the light switches on the Sabbath.

After the collapse of Communism, in 1991, Jewish intellectuals, all of them, and all over the world, worked tirelessly to set up “*democratic*” regimes – again, all over the world – and the constitution of a world government. It is quite obviously always the same plan: building the “*Empire of Peace*” (shalom), a “*world without borders*”, where men would be “*free and equal*”, and in which all identities will have disappeared forever – except for theirs.

In sum, Communism made its appearance a little too early, and perhaps a bit too brutally. It is to come about as merely the natural consequence of liberal globalism, of the planetary uniformity engendered by materialist society.

## V

### Anti-Semitism

The Jews are hypersensitive to the slightest hint of anti-Semitism. The most insignificant bit of graffiti on a school yard wall is immediately noted, and the information is very quickly relayed to a rabbi. The slightest pushing or shoving incident in a door doorway triggers a deluge of protests. Governmental ministers profess great indignation as loudly as they can, although the murder of a mere *goy* leaves them indifferent. That which has been called the “*great Jewish intolerance of frustration*” is in fact one of the characteristic traits of the entire Jewish community: they cannot tolerate the slightest criticism, the slightest remark perceived as “*hostile*”. They get hugely indignant, heaping calumny upon the person deemed guilty, never hesitating before the foulest slanders – something “anti-Semites” have always complained of, all down through the ages. To finish the job, they file lawsuits, unless the victim apologizes publicly.

The Marxist philosopher Jacques Derrida writes: “*My vigilance, I think I can say, was without rest since the age of six, with regards to racism and anti-Semitism*”. He had in him, he said, “*a nervous vigilance, an exhausting aptitude in sniffing out signs of racism, in the most discrete configurations and the noisiest denials*”.

This obsession is an invariable characteristic of all “cosmopolitan” thinkers. In the Jewish community, there is a hyper-emotiveness, an anguish, even an in-born paranoia, which disposes the leaders of this community to man the battlements at the slightest sign of hostility.

The fact that almost the whole French government attends an annual dinner at the CRIF (Representative Council of Jewish Institutions of France) really ought to reassure them; but an atavistic, secular, disquiet appears to be a fundamental characteristic of Judaism, which explains why, throughout history, the Jews can always be heard complaining, once again, of a “*renewal of anti-Semitism*”.

It is moreover striking to observe that synagogues are the only places of public worship in which the faithful must barricade themselves behind bomb-proof doors. A foreign observer – a “Candide” – might legitimately ask here, “Hey, these people don’t seem to think that other people like them very much”. Perhaps they

have something on their conscience?

Anti-Semitism is useful, too. Disproportionately magnified by the media system, it permits the maintenance among the Jews of the entire world of a fragile identity, constantly under threat of disappearance through assimilation into the host country. Over-sensationalized anti-Semitism thus reinforces the cohesion of the community.

## **An “Inexplicable Phenomenon”**

Since Antiquity to most recent times, the Jews have been expelled everywhere, from all countries, both Christian and Muslim, many times over. In his memoirs, Elie Wiesel is compelled to observe: *“Jewish history describes a permanent conflict between us and others. Since Abraham, we are one side and the entire world is on the other.”* And he asks himself: *“Why so many persecutions, so much oppression? What have we done wrong to men so that they wish us so much ill? I will open myself to my masters about it, and yet again to my friends. We will try to understand. For the whole answer, my Masters made us read the Bible and reread the Bible, over and over again, the prophets, the martyrological literature.”*

For the Jews, anti-Semitism is quite simply inexplicable. Martin Gray, in *For Those I Loved*, wonders about this incomprehensible hatred: *“Why this hatred against us, why the death, everywhere, threatening?”* “The poor Jews live *“in the midst of rabid, insane beasts”*.”

The historian Paul Friedlander denounces *“Hitler’s wild imaginings on the Jews”*. Why did Adolf Eichmann, a high Nazi official, feel the need to combat Judaism? Here is what Simon Wiesenthal has to say about it? *“I was mistaken in searching the events of his early youth for the motivation for his conduct. There was no motive, no hatred. Eichmann was only a product of the regime”*.

In his book entitled *Discourse of Hatred*, published in 2004, the French philosopher Andre Glucksmann writes: *“Hatred of the Jews is the enigma of enigmas. This destructive passion, extending over the thousands of years, dresses according to the fashion of the day, is constantly reborn from the ashes of various fanaticisms which appear to motivate it... For the anti-Semite, the object of his aversion is like an unidentified flying object. He doesn’t know who or what he is talking about... the Jew is in no way the source of anti-Semitism; one must think of this passion in itself and by itself, as if the Jew which it pursues, without knowing anything about him, did not even exist”*. *“One*

cannot explain anti-Semitism”, confirms rabbi Josy Eisenberg.

*“Auschwitz exceeds my faculties of comprehension and our powers of analysis”*, writes Raphael Draï in 1989. *“Why the silence or the eclipse of God during this period of horror? Why? I do not know, despite the many books I have studied.”*

In his book entitled *Hitler’s Willing Executioners*, published in 1996, Daniel Goldhagen also pretend to be unable understand. The Holocaust is, according to him, *“the most difficult event to understand in all of German history... The Holocaust and the change in sensitivities which it implies, defy explanation... Explaining the manner in which the Holocaust may have occurred is a very difficult task”*, he writes in the introduction. *“The history of anti-Semitism in the Germany of the 19th century is of a very great complexity”*.

*“It is one of the most irritating and disconcerting facts of contemporary history”*, writes Hannah Arendt in her book entitled *On Anti-Semitism*. The famous Primo Levi expressed a similar view in *If This Is A Man* (1958). *“A few historians, among the most serious ones (Bullock, Schramm, Bracher), recognize that they do not understand Hitler’s relentless anti-Semitism, and consequently, of Germany. Perhaps because what happened has not been understood, and even, should not be understood, in the measure that to understand is perhaps to justify... In the Nazi hatred, there is nothing rational: is it a hatred which is not in us, which is foreign to man... We cannot understand it”*.

## The Scapegoat Theory

In his book, *The Psychiatry of Anti-Semitism* (1952), Rudolph Loewenstein explains that anti-Semitism is *“neither paranoiac nor phobic”*, but is a matter of *“mere criminology”*. And he continues in a classical register: *“The Jews have been the victims of sadism and political ambition and could be persecuted with impunity, pillaged and murdered. It has often happened to them to be hated for their very vulnerability. Man is very much attracted by the possibilities of slaking their instincts of cruelty against defenseless victims... The Jews, a weak minority, to whom people attributed a ‘shadowy and formidable power’, offered the Nazi leaders ‘the punching bag they had long been looking for’”*.

The Jews are thus said to be *“collectively guilty”* – all of them, even unborn children – for epidemics in the Middle Ages, for Communism, for capitalism, for the Death of Christ, for disastrous wars and equally disastrous peace treaties. All the evils of humanity, the Black Plague

and the Atomic Bomb, are the “*fault of the Jews*’. *We are the eternal scapegoats*”. It should be noted here that Jewish intellectuals always pretend to be unable to understand why “*anti-Semites*” accuse them of promoting both Communism and capitalism simultaneously.

It should first of all be noted that “*scapegoat*” is a concept originating in the Torah. The “*scapegoat*” was an animal charged with all the sins of Israel, after which the Jews chased him out and to die in the desert. For a moment, one might almost have been inclined to think that Jewish intellectuals were “*projecting*” their guilt onto the “*anti-Semites*”...

## Denying the Evidence

Jewish intellectuals seem compelled to deny all crimes, even in the face of the evidence. One could thus hear such and such a media personality rise up and raise a howl against the “*myth of Jewish finance*””. “*People talk a lot about the ‘Jewish lobby’*”, writes Pierre Birnbaum (2005), who adds: “*The ‘Jewish lobby’ does not exist. This word belongs to anti-Semitic terminology*”.

Above all, most Jewish intellectuals deny the overwhelming role played by their fellow Jews in the Communist tragedy. In *If This Is A Man*, Primo Levi writes: “*Hitler’s idée fixe, for whom Judaism was confused with Bolshevism, had no objective basis, and even less in Germany, where it was notorious that the overwhelming majority of Jews belonged to the bourgeoisie*”.

The historian Arkadi Vaksberg, in turn, calmly affirms (*Stalin and the Jews*, 2003): “*The ‘excessive’ share of the Jews in the revolution, and the resulting consequences, is an idea which owes a great deal to the world of imagination, to myth*”.

## The Inversion of Reality

They often prefer, not without a certain brass nerve – the famous *chutzpah* – to represent themselves as the first and foremost victims of Communism. Norman Cohn, Alain Brossart, Gabriel Eschenazi have expressed this idea.

Jacques Attali in turn attempts to make us believe that the Jews were persecuted in the USSR (*The Jews, the World and Money*, 2002). As early in 1920, he writes, “*the teaching of Hebrew, a ‘reactionary and clerical language’, was prohibited... The annihilation of Russian*

*Judaism is continuing*". For their part, the writers Marek Halter and Samuel Pisar attempt to make us believe that in 1941, their evacuation to the East, in Tashkent, a country vacation spot, was a "deportation" (see *The Planetary Hopes*).

in his book *Two Centuries Together*, Alexander Solzhenitsyn became indignant about the remarks of this Simon Schwartz, who spoke of "*the legend of the influence of the Jews, and the false ideas as to the exaggerated role of the Jews within State bodies*". According to him, the Jews simply had "*almost no possibility of survival, except by serving the State*". "*One is ashamed to read that*", says Solzhenitsyn indignantly. "*What is this situation of oppression and despair which leaves you no possibility of survival except in privileged positions?*"

Solzhenitsyn quotes Isaac Stern, who affirms with aplomb that the Jews were the first victories of the regime: "*Soviet history*", he says, "*is entirely marked by a constant determination to grind out and exterminate the Jews... Soviet power was particularly hard on the Jews*". Louis Ferdinand Celine understood this trick very well: "*The aggressor screams as he cuts your throat*", he writes. "*The trick is as old as Moses*".

## **The Good Deeds of the Jews**

Anti-Semitism is the result of the benefits brought to humanity by the Jews. These benefits are so great that they embarrass those who receive them, and awaken hatred against their benefactors among the recipients. In his *Apology for Israel*, Albert Caracco writes: "*We are punished because we were beneficial and because good disturbs the order of things.*" And again: "*They will never pardon the Jews for the benefits to which they indebted to them.*"

George Tabori, Viennese writer, actor and film director, said the same thing (*Jewish Portraits*, 1989): "*It was the Jews who formulated the laws... the Ten Commandments, the prescriptions of hygiene of Moses and others... these laws are a good thing, a reasonable thing, in a way a perfect moral code. But it is impossible to comply with them to the end. Hence results this feeling of a bad conscience, of permanent irritation against the Jews. They represent the Biblical law, and their very existence reminds Christians of the inaccessible ideal*".

In *The Jews, The World and Money*, (2002) Jacques Attali expresses this same idea that those who oppose the Jews are showing great ingratitude. "*In 325, at the Council of Nice*", he writes, "*Christian anti-Judaism was set up, founded on the hatred of those who had*

*brought the Good Word. The hatred of him who had rendered service. We will find this much later in the relationship with money: the hatred of him who lends money to others after having had it supplied by his God”.*

For the period of the Middle Ages, Attali attempts to make us believe that the Jews were not permitted to exercise any trade except that of usurers or money lenders, although in reality they practised these same professions from the remotest antiquity: *“As they were forced into money lending to start with, they plunged themselves into it completely. To their greater misfortune. Once again, they will be useful and they will be hated for the services which they render... The Jews are hated for having supplied them with their God and their money, because [the anti-Semites] hate themselves, because they can no longer do without either one”.*

## **The Jealousy of the Anti-Semites**

In *Life and Destiny* (1960), the Soviet novelist Vassili Grossman presents these explanations: *“Anti-Semitism”, he writes, “is the expression of a lack of talent, of the inability to win in a struggle with equal weapons; this is true in all fields, in the sciences as well as in commerce, in handicrafts as in painting. It is also the manifestation of the absence of culture in the popular masses, incapable of analyzing the causes of their sufferings. Uncultured men see the causes of their misfortunes in the Jews and not in the social and governmental order. Anti-Semitism is the measure of religious prejudices which hover in the dregs of society... Everyday anti-Semitism is an anti-Semitism which causes no blood to flow. It attests to the existence on earth of envious idiots, reactionaries and failures.”*

## **Always Innocent**

The Jews are always innocent of everything they are ever criticized for. In his book, *The World of Yesterday* (1944), the famous Stefan Zweig expresses the astonishment of his fellow Jews obliged to flee Hitler's Germany: *“The most tragic thing”, he writes, “in this tragedy of the 20th century, is that those who endured it could not discover the sense of it, or any fault on their part... What was the motive, what the sense, what was the purpose of this persecution?... No one could find the answer. Even Freud, the clearest intelligence of his time, with whom I*



*often spoke in those days, found no explanation, found no sense in this nonsense”.*

Communist criminals? Silly question: they weren't *really* Jews; they were Communists! Saul Friedlander writes this way: *“The essential thing, which anti-Semites forgot, was the simple fact that the Soviet Jews, on all levels of the system, were first and foremost Soviet citizens devoted to the ideas and objectives of the USSR and forgetful of their origins”.*

The Jewish historian Gabriel Eschenazi in turn explains that the new Jewish leaders of Poland, in 1945, were not really Jews: *“The ‘Jewish’ party leaders such as Jakun Berman, Hilary Minc or Roman Zambrowski had broken with their Jewish origins and defined themselves solely as Communists and Poles”.* Just because the Jews were *“numerous at the top of the Party”* and that they *“occupied most of the positions in the central party”* doesn't mean that Communism was a Jewish dictatorship; those Jews weren't really Jews at all! *“We find ourselves faced by a new paradox”,* writes Gabriel Eschenazi, *“in becoming Communists, the Jews ceased to be Jews in the eyes of their milieu, but for the Poles, they became more ‘Jewish’ than ever, and ‘Jews’ of the worst kind.”*

In this openly twisted genre, we may yet again cite the passage by Jacques Attali (*The Jews, The World and Money*): *“They even accuse the Jews of being indirectly responsible for the Shoah: Hitler, according to certain German historians like Ernst Nolte, was only a response to Marxism and the Soviet Union. It suffices to add that Marxism and the Soviet Union are ‘Jewish Creations’ so that the persecution of the Jew becomes, supreme refinement, responsible for his own persecution!”* Which cannot be true, of course, because the Jew, so to speak, is always innocent by nature.

*“Why did God persecute the innocent?”* demands the psychoanalyst Rudolph Lowenstein.

Stephane Zagdanski (*On Anti-Semitism*, 1995), does not hesitate to write: *“It is even precisely because they are the cause of none of the things of which they are accused that the Jews have been detested for so long and in so many places”.*

We see that Solzhenitsyn was therefore right when he became indignant over the refusal of the great majority of Jews to shoulder their share of the responsibility for the Communist experiment. In this difficult exercise, one cannot help but notice the past mastery of every sort of intellectual contortion, each more astonishing than the last. After all, the Barnum, Bailey and Ringling Brothers travelling circuses and side shows will always be there to dazzle the hopelessly stupid goy hayseeds...

## Anti-Semitism: An Illness

These personages confirm that anti-Semitism is an illness, at least in the mind of the Jews. In his monumental *History of Anti-Semitism*, the very serious Léon Poliakov exposes the pathological nature of German anti-Semitism after the defeat of 1918. For him, the explanation is rather simple: the Germans were seized by a rather common illness – the persecution syndrome – which may lead people who are afflicted with it to the most total insanity: “*The day after the October Revolution*”, he writes, “*the remarks of a certain leaders of German destinies came close to delirium*”, because “*an uncertain number of Bolsheviks were of Jewish origins... The frenzied tendency accentuated itself because it became obvious that Germany had lost the war*”.

For Daniel Goldhagen, the Germans were deeply infected: “*The corpus of German anti-Semitic literature of the 19th and 20th centuries with its savage and hallucinatory texts on the nature of the Jews, on their virtually limitless power, their near-total responsibility for almost all the ills afflicting the world, is at this point so far removed from reality that the reader is obliged to conclude that it is quite simply the product of a group of pen pushers in an insane asylum... the beliefs contain elements proper to hallucinations.*”

In her study *On Anti-Semitism* (1951), the famous Hannah Arendt writes: “*Anti-Semitism, as an ideology, remained, with rare exceptions, the prerogative of eccentrics in general and a few lunatics in particular*”. For her, anti-Semitism is an “*insult to good sense*”, a phobia of “*illuminated people*”. The famous *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* are the best illustration. The document is dismissed as a great forgery, a “*grotesque*” fantasy, an “*incredible fairy tale*”.

Norman Cohn confirms this: anti-Semitism was “*reanimated and modernised in the 19th and 20th centuries by a handful of eccentric and reactionary Christians*”, driven mad by a frenzied text: the famous *Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion*. The book is a collection of “*ludicrous ideas*”, of “*ridiculous fantasies*”. And Cohn adds: “*There is a subterranean world in which pathological fantasies disguised as ideas are used by swindlers and half-illiterate fanatics to excite the ignorant superstitious masses*”.

In *The Fault of the Jews* (2002), Guy Konopnicki writes: “*One can never simply make the transition from a denunciation of capitalism to a denunciation of occult financial powers fomenting a world conspiracy. The people who trot out this obsession never express a single idea, apart from the most vulgar kind of anti-Semitism. It may be that this*

*error is committed without their knowledge, but that is one of the properties of delirium”.*

In 1974, in the last part of his *History of the Jewish People*, the rabbi Josy Eisenberg wrote (presumably without smiling): “*We do not intend here to explain the roots of anti-Semitism. For clinicians, the individual or collective impulses which underlie anti-Semitism are only explained by recourse to psychoanalysis, a recourse which exceeds the limits of this book and our means of investigation*”.

In March 2004, Jeff Jacoby, editorialist at the Boston Globe, dedicated a file to the resurgence of the “*cancer of anti-Semitism in Europe*”. Listen to what Abraham Foxman, the president of the ADL, said about Mel Gibson, director of *The Passion of Christ*, under the influence of alcohol, before excusing himself before the Jewish community under the effect of we know not what kind of pressure: “*That he should seek treatment for his alcoholism is a good thing*”, Foxman declared clearly, but “*anti-Semitism is a disease of the non-Jewish brain, not of the Jewish brain. We are only the victims*”.

## **The Madness of Men**

Manes Sperber analyses the matter as follows: “*The hatred of Jews*”, he writes, “*appeared to me at a very young age as an aggressive persecution delirium... like a frenzied fear of others... in his monomaniacal hostility [the anti-Semite] persuades himself that he enjoys an insurmountable superiority over those whom he hates, whom he must despise, as well as fear, because they are of a diabolical wickedness.*” And Manes Sperber adds in passing: “*While this hatred sometimes constitutes for us the worst of dangers, it is nevertheless your illness. It is the evil with which you are afflicted. Without doubt it has caused us indescribable sufferings, but we will continue to overcome it no matter what form it takes.*”

For Rudolph Loewenstein (*Psychoanalysis of Anti-Semitism*) the “*frenzied beliefs relating to the Jews*” have no basis in fact. One must therefore do everything possible to avoid a repetition of “*frenzied crises of anti-Semitism*”.

The thing is understood: anti-Semites are insane. Stalin, the tyrant, the executioner, the nationalist, proves quite useful in crystallizing the horrors of the Soviet regime. Stalin becomes the ideal “*scapegoat*” who can be accused of all evil. Elie Wiesel writes thus in his *Memoirs* (1994): “*Stalin is insane, his hatred renders him insane*”.

On the broadcast *Everyone is Talking About It* (6 May 2006), Elie

Wiesel said, with regards to the Iranian President Ahmadinejad: *“The religious head of Iran is insane, I mean pathologically sick: he is insane with hatred”*. To which he added, logically: *“His bomb does not threaten Israel, but the entire world”*. You’ve got it right: all those who oppose the plans of the Jews are *“insane”*.

## Accusatory Projection

The mechanism of “projection” is quite common among Jewish intellectuals. Vassili Grossman (*Life and Destiny*, 1960) explains: *“Anti-Semitism is the mirror of the defects of a man taken individually, of civil societies, of governmental systems. Tell me what you accuse the Jews of, and I will tell you what you are guilty of yourself”*.

Raphael Draï, in *Jewish Identity, Human Identity*, 1995, thinks the same way: *“The anti-Semite attributes to Jews precisely those intentions which are truest of themselves... The psychopathological dimension of such a construction is quite remarkable... the Jews depicted in the imagination are only projections... the ‘Judaised’ image is proper to the delirium of anti-Semitism”*.

Manes Sperber explains that the anti-Semite hates – *“in the Other”* – *“precisely those same defects from which he would most like to rid himself. He excuses them and conceals them more easily by imagining them grotesquely magnified in those whom he hates”*.

In *Anti-Semitism*, published in 2006, Jewish “philosopher” Alexis Rosenbaum wonders: *“Is anti-Semitism the expression of a neurosis?”*, before explaining: *“The mechanism of projection is regularly accompanied by an accusatory inversion. In fact, the Jews are blamed for precisely the same crimes which others would like to commit, too, or are preparing to commit, against the Jews themselves... From the psycho-analytic point of view, this state of fact is symptomatic of the process of inversion between the victim and the torturer (or ‘projective inversion’). Thus, one persecutes the Jews because he imagines or convinces himself at once that he is exculpating himself and inculpating the target of his hatred.”* “Anti-Semitism”, he writes, once again, *“is characterised... by a strong tendency to wild fantasy... [anti-Semites] construct theories of a measureless exaggeration... which are often very ingenious, but are in no way disturbed by the fact that none of the great accusations directed at the Jews has ever been supported by any evidence. Whether he is obsessed with the Semites or the Zionists, it is almost impossible to reason with him.”*

In 1959, Primo Levi, with regards to Hitlerian anti-Semitism,

wrote: “It was no doubt a matter of a personal obsession, the roots of which remain unknown, even if he talked a lot about it. They said he was afraid he had Jewish blood in his veins since one of his grandmothers got pregnant while working in a house belonging to Jews; he felt this fear all his life; obsessed by purity, he feared he was not pure himself. Other explanations have been offered by psychoanalysts, explanations which explained everything, correctly: they said, they have said, that Hitler was paranoid and perverse, that he projected upon the Jews the characteristics of which he wished to rid himself.”

Daniel Goldhagen writes as follows: “*Anti-Semitism tells us nothing about the Jews, but a lot about anti-Semites and the culture which nourishes them*”. The “*hallucinated accusations*” of the anti-Semites are therefore just a mirror of anti-Semitism.

The Jewish intellectual, as we see, projects upon anti-Semites everything he feels guilty for, including his tendency towards “*accusatory inversion*”. Once we have understood this principle, it suffices simply to switch the terms “*Jews*” and “*anti-Semites*” to understand the roots of the problem. To gain a proper understanding of Jewish intellectuals, they must be read with a mirror.

We understand better now why the Nazis, on certain occasions, were permitted to burn the books of all the Jewish intellectuals, each more perfidious and perverted than the last. In the film *Raiders of the Lost Arc* (USA, 1980), we see a scene of this kind. One must however bear in mind at this point that Orthodox Jews have always burned the books of their adversaries within their own community. Thus the books of Maimonides were burnt by the rabbis in the Middle Ages, just as the books of the Hassidic Jews were burnt in the 18th century. On 20 May 2008, in Israel, New Testaments were burnt by Jewish students of Yehuda.

Here again is a beautiful example of accusatory inversion, from the pen of Stephane Zagdanski (2006). Listen to this: “*Anti-Semitic logic is characterised by paranoid inversion*”, writes Zagdanski. “...*The privileged function of anti-Semitism is paranoid inversion, and the privileged language of inversion is calumny. Which explains why each anti-Semitic idea is the methodical contrary of the truth... Each of the statements made by anti-Semitism*”, he continues, “*is a great neurosis. It would be a good idea to go see a psychoanalyst... Anti-Semitism gets lost in obsessive calculations for the purpose of learning nothing about its own delirium*”. One need only switch the terms “*Jew*” and “*anti-Semite*” to understand that Zagadansky is sick himself.

## Hatred of Humanity

It is, allegedly, quite simply impossible for individuals to derive rational nourishment from hostility towards Jews, and solely against the Jews, simply because there are no rational grounds for such hostility. Since they need to justify themselves, Jewish intellectuals always try to create confusion by representing Jews as the victims of intolerance, like Protestants, lepers, witches, foreigners and people who are “different”.

Since the Jews are just like everybody else, hatred of the Jews can only, therefore, be the symptom of a hatred of all of humanity! Here, Jewish intellectuals project onto a universal plane that which is, in reality, of concern solely to themselves. In *For Those I Loved*, the famous Martin Gray writes: “*Here, at Treblinka, it was not just the Jews they killed, it was not just a particular race they were exterminating: the torturers wished to destroy Man*”.

“*It is this way, and there is nothing anyone can do about it*”, writes Elie Wiesel in his Memoirs: “*The enemy of the Jews is the enemy of humanity. And vice versa. In killing Jews, the killer kills more than just Jews. He begins with the Jews: but he inevitably attacks other ethnic groups, religions and social groups... By killing Jews, the killers were attempting to murder all of humanity*”.

The analysis of Clara Goldschmidt, wife of the writer André Malraux, is very much in agreement: “*Persecution*”, she writes, “*is less difficult to bear when one knows that it is totally unjustified and that, therefore, the enemy is transforming himself into the enemy of humanity*”.

Jacques Attali also recalled the well-known rules of Judaism (*The Jews, the World and Money*, 2002), “*To impose a very strict morality upon oneself, tolerating neither arrogance nor immorality, to create neither jealousy nor pretext for persecution*”. It was just about time for somebody to say that, in fact.

## VI

### The Mafia

It is impossible to summarize the power of this Mafia in a few words, under pain of not being believed. We published a 400-page book on the subject in 2008, containing all the information the reader will ever need to prove that the Jewish Mafia is, by far the most powerful Mafia in the world. Here we present a small glimpse of this octopus-like international power, engaged in all illegal activities: Ecstasy, heroin, cocaine, prostitution, gambling, porn, arms dealing, plus money laundering, through the agency, in particular, of the diamond industry.

The production and distribution of Ecstasy all over the world is entirely in the hands of the Jewish Mafia. In fact, all the dealers who have ever been indicted anywhere in the world – without a single exception – (see *The Jewish Mafia*, 2008) – have been Jewish criminals. And all of them were in possession of Israeli passports, for the simple reason that the State of Israel almost never extradites Israeli citizens.

*Liberation*, the daily newspaper, of 23 July 2001, in fact, informs us that the Israeli Mafia has “*hijacked the market in synthetic drugs*”. The 11 August 2001 issue of *Le Figaro* confirms this: “*Ecstasy is the private hunting ground of the Israeli criminal underground*”.

The synthetic drug called “Ecstasy”, which provides a sensation of power and well-being for a few hours, is a veritable chemical garbage can. Its effects, long term, are irreversible: memory loss, behavioural disturbances, sleep disturbances, loss of concentration, and brain damage in the children of drug-addicted mothers. But these complications are of no matter in the eyes of the dealers.

Holland is the most important producer in the world. The drug is produced there in dozens of clandestine laboratories. At the head of the traffic, we find Israelis linked to various “*Russian*” mafias, which organize the networks supplying Europe, the United States, Japan and Australia. Sometimes the dealers use young Orthodox Jews to smuggle the drug past border check points. For a long time, customs agents never even thought of suspecting these religious Jews in their black caftans, black hats and ringlets. Each of these “mules” transported 35,000 to 50,000 tablets per trip. These smugglers, who criss-crossed

between Europe and the United States, were paid 1500 dollars per trip.

The Israeli daily newspaper *Haaretz* of 6 April 2003, confirms the role of these “Israeli” criminals: “*Israel is the hub of the international Ecstasy traffic, according to a document published by the United States Department of State. These past few years, organized crime in Israel, linked to criminal organizations in Russia, has taken control of distribution of the drug in Europe, according to an official document. This document notes that the Israeli criminal groups have taken control of the Ecstasy traffic in North America. Over the course of the year 2000, 80% of all the Ecstasy sold in the United States originated from Holland, which is the largest centre of production.*”

*The Arc*, known as “*the monthly of French Judaism*”, published this information in May 2007: “*Zeev Rosenstein, the most famous godfather of the Israeli milieu, has returned from the United States to complete a 12-year prison sentence for drug dealing*”. Rosenstein was sentenced for importing 850,000 Ecstasy pills into the United States. The weekly newspaper *Marianne*, on 18 August 2007, informs us that Rosenstein’s organization was active on four continents, and used “*small Latin-American gangs of smugglers for the distribution of his synthetic drug.*”

At a cost of production of 20 or 25 cents, one single Ecstasy pill, sold to a distributor for 2 dollars, who himself resells it in a discotheque for 10 or 15 dollars, or even 30-40 dollars, can feed quite a large family. What is more, if the discotheque belongs to you, this makes you “King of the Night”.

The reality of “*accusatory inversion*” is easily verified, for example, by the 1987 film by Gerard Oury, *Levy et Goliath*: Moise Levy, a Hassidic Jew and diamond dealer at Antwerp, has fallen out with brother Albert, a Parisian cafe owner, ever since the latter married a *goy*. Moise takes the train for France, where he is supposed to deliver diamond powder to the Renault factory, but he finds himself involved, despite himself, in a coke trafficking deal. The coke dealers and pimps here are tall, blond-haired “Aryans” with blue eyes, very wicked and very anti-Semitic, while the Jews are always very likeable and innocent.

The film *Lethal Weapon* (USA, 1987), shows the methods of these horrible drug traffickers.

Two cops – one white and one Negro – are assigned to arrest the evil-doers. The two cops are atrociously tortured in the basement of a night club owned by one of the dealers. But you shouldn’t be surprised: the bad guys here are Viet Nam vets, white men, as usual, with blond hair and blue eyes. The poor Jews are completely innocent. The film is signed Richard Donner.



The sequel to *Lethal Weapon 2* (1989) is even more of a caricature: The two cops, who symbolize the triumphant multicultural society, are, this time, fighting a dangerous gang of South African drug dealers. The villains are all white – always Nordic, blond-haired and blue-eyed, and terribly, terribly racist. Richard Donner's real name, let us note, is Richard Schwarzenberg. This information may be useful in understanding the messages disseminated through his films.

The film *Blood Diamonds* (USA, 2007) is a good example of media furtiveness whenever a Jewish criminal type is involved. The film only shows the role of the Jews in the diamond industry in one single image: an Orthodox Jew appears on the screen... for one-half second! The viewers are completely hood-winked. In his genre, the director, Edward Zwick, is a magician. You must realize, in fact, that the international diamond business, legal or illegal, is 100% in the hands of Jewish firms or dealers.

In the French film *Taxi* (1998), the dangerous criminals are Germans of the Nordic type, as stupid as they are wicked: a film by Gerard Pires.

In *The Firm* (USA, 1993), a young diplomat has just been recruited by a powerful law firm in Memphis. He gradually comes to the realisation that the company managers are in fact working for a terrible mafia gang in Chicago. All the lawyers present – about thirty of them – are white, Catholic and Nordic. They symbolize the American elite at its hypocritical best. The film is by Sydney Pollack, who also practises the technique of accusatory inversion. Thus it is that the Jews are always portrayed as innocent victims.

## The Great Swindles

Not all swindlers are Jews, and not all Jews are swindlers. But, as Jacques Attali said, in 2002, “*among Jews, as always, one never does anything by halves: if you're going to be a criminal, you might as well as well be the best*”. And the fact is that the really great swindles are exclusively the work of the Jews. We will only present a succinct summary of a few: we advise you to read *The Jewish Mafia* (2008), to become aware of the details and juicy anecdotes linked to these scandals.

We know that since the signature of the Kyoto agreements, by virtue of the principle that “*the polluter pays*”, all industrialists must acquire “*rights*” to compensate for the environmental damage caused by their activity. In 2007, the opening of the financial markets to

*“carbon credits”* attracted international swindlers.

In Paris, it was sufficient to supply a photocopy of your identity card to obtain the status of a “broker”. Between the fall of 2008 and 2009, a colossal embezzlement of VAT on the “carbon tax” permitted the crooks to steal 1.4 billion euros from the French taxpayer. Sitting in Parisian internet cafes, the swindlers, over the BlueNet CO<sub>2</sub> exchange system, acquired tons of “CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents” for non-existent clients, without paying tax, in foreign countries, with a click of the computer. They then diverted these quotas to different countries to cover their tracks, then resold their cargoes in France to polluting industries, such as cement plants and electricity producers, invoicing them for VAT at 19.6%, which they never paid over to the state. The money evaporated instantly into accounts in Lithuania, Montenegro, or Hong Kong or Cyprus. The brains of the operation, Gregory Zaoui, had begun his criminal career by fraudulently reselling jeans and portable phones. Justice sent dozens of letters rogatory to Israel. As a result, the Ministry of Finance was compelled to reduce VAT on CO<sub>2</sub> to zero per cent to restrict the fraud. Europol estimated the extent of the fraud at 5 billion euros. Have you ever heard of this gigantic swindle? No, of course not. Which is quite normal, because these same people control our TV channels.

Here’s another recent scandal: In December 2008, it was revealed that approximately 400 complaints had been filed by tradesmen, merchants and associations in a single year. The swindlers solicited electronic listings by fax or telephone. The inquiries led to the indictment of four persons in France in the month of April, followed by about thirty people in Israel by early December, in which 700,000 euros worth of jewellery and luxury vehicles were also seized. You haven’t heard about this scandal? Perfectly normal.

In March 2008, another gigantic VAT fraud was revealed, the brain of which was a certain Avi Rebibo, “*a Franco-Israeli*”.

We also recall the Claude Lipsky affair, the “*swindler of the century*”, who was sentenced in 2007 for embezzling the savings of 450 French soldiers.

In 2006, the swindler Gilbert Chickli, who swindled the banks by telephone, fled to Israel with 23 million euros.

In 2001-2004, the scope of the “Sentier” money laundering scandal was estimated at one billion euros. The media, curiously, did not insist on these matters.

There was also the recent case of Jacques Crozmarie, president of the Cancer Research Association, who embezzled money from TV viewers. He was sentenced in 2000. The swindler only repaid 26% of

the money entrusted to him by French citizens. He also manifested a classic example of phenomenal *chutzpah*, declaring before French TV cameras: “*I had pocketed even a single penny I would be a criminal. But look at my representation expenses, they are nothing! I don’t even get my meals reimbursed when I eat at restaurants!*”

In the USA, swindles occur in mammoth proportions. In April 2010, for example, a business man was prosecuted for a pyramid scheme. On Wednesday 21 April, the regulatory agency for the American stock market, the SEC, announced that it was bringing proceedings against the President of a Florida investment fund, Nevin K. Shapiro, for a 900 million dollars “Ponzi-type” pyramid scheme.

The year before, in November 2009, another Ponzi-type pyramid scheme, mounted by the lawyer Scott W. Rothstein, amounted to a billion dollars, according to The Wall Street Journal. The star lawyer of Florida was accused of selling shares in extra-judicial agreements to investors, promising 2-digit returns.

In February 2009, a stock market fraud exploded before the London Stock Exchange, for the sum of 600 million dollars. The principal protagonist was a certain Abraham Hochman.

On 18 January 2009, we learn that a Florida business man, Arthur Nadel, disappeared with 350 million dollars he was managing. In 2006, there was the “Abramoff swindle” as well.

All these swindlers were small fry compared to Bernard Madoff. This New York financier was nicknamed “the Jewish Treasury Bond” by members of the Jewish-American community. But the returns which he distributed to his clients were not the result of financial investments: he simply collected funds from new investors and distributed them to old ones. In December 2008, his company went bankrupt, ruining thousands of savers, and, at the same time, numerous influential Jews. He stole the investments of the Stephen Spielberg Foundation and the Elie Wiesel Foundation. Fifty billion dollars disappeared! It was the biggest swindle in the history of the world.

But the Jewish mafia was even more powerful in Russia, after the collapse of the Soviet Regime. In the 1990s, a handful of “oligarchs” got their clutches on the near-totality of Russian wealth, creating a reign of terror in the streets of the big cities, while the little people suffered in silence (see the summary in *The Jewish Mafia*, 2008). It requires an understanding of the actions of these people – Mikhail Khodorkovsky, Roman Abramovich and other, Boris Berezovsky – to understand the anti-Semitism of many Russians. Starting in 2000, the new Russian President, Vladimir Putin began to clean house. Since then, Khodorkovsky is in prison, and his fellow Jews fled to Israel,

London or the Cote d'Azur.

The Pavel Lungin film, *Tycoon* (2003), of course, shows none of this. This is the scenario: at the end of the 80s, Platon Makovsky and his friends, young brilliant university students, abandon their scientific studies to launch themselves in business. Platon became the richest man in his country. Alas, he is soon killed in an assassination. The people responsible for this cowardly murder – stock “bad guys” – are all Russian patriots, tall, strong, with blue eyes, who are swindling the people and will stop at nothing to eliminate Platon, the likeable billionaire. There is obviously no need to study “Pavel Lungin”'s family tree to guess which “Mafia” he belongs to...

## International Pimping

This topic was the object of a long very well documented chapter in our book entitled *The Jewish Mafia*. Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, in 1989, tens of thousands of young women from Eastern Europe have been caught up by prostitution networks and sent to distant destinations.

The collapse of the USSR in 1991 led to a considerable impoverishment of the population. To attempt to escape from the misery and meet the needs of their young families, many young Russian, Ukrainian or Moldovan women answered attractive ads in newspapers. Unfortunately for them, these offers to work abroad proved to be traps laid by international pimps. The media remain extremely discreet on this subject. In the month of May 2000, however, a report by Amnesty International revealed the scope of the phenomenon and pointed the finger at the State of Israel, as the turntable of this traffic.

Here again, we shall only present a few recent incidents: on 20 September 2009, we learned that an international luxury prostitution network had been dismantled in Paris. Three people were charged with “aggravated pimping” and membership in a “criminal organization”. Young women from Eastern Europe had been coerced into relations with business men. The *Nouvel Observateur* spoke of a “couple from Narbonne”. The head of the network was said to be a 38-year old woman, manager of a clothing store, and “of Moroccan origin”. In the French press, usually, they explain that the persons responsible are “Lebanese”, “Russian”, “Chechen”, or “Armenian”. If the press never gives their names, it is because there is a good reason not to: in fact, one had to read the Egyptian newspaper *Al Yom Saabeh* to learn that

this was the work of the Jewish Mafia.

In December 2008, at Limoges, information was received from an Israeli pimp, Moshe Suissa, adding: "Several thousand women were 'sold' to prostitution networks in Israel over the last four years, according to the inquiry of a Parliamentary committee. From 3,000 to 5,000 women were the victims of this traffic, which earned thousands of billions per year. According to a police inquiry, 120 persons were arrested for pimping in the past 15 years and sentenced to from 2 to 15 years in prison". Let us note that this is a question of 3 to 5 thousand women per year, most of them literally kidnapped in Russia, the Ukraine or Moldova, through deceptive newspaper ads.

Sergio Leone's beautiful film *One Upon a Time in America* (1984), tells the story of Jewish gangsters arriving in New York from their native Poland at the beginning of the century. We see them dedicating themselves to smuggling alcohol and all sorts of other sordid rackets. They burglarize a jewellery store, liquidate their competitors, become nightclub owners, and do not hesitate to prostitute women of their own tribe. Later, their leader changes his identity in order to become a Senator.

In *L.A. Confidential* (USA, 1997), a film by Curtis Hanford, after the novel by James Ellroy, Jewishness is shown with great discretion. The beginning of the film presents the godfather of the local mafia, in the Los Angeles of the 1950s: Meyer Cohen – "Mickey C., to his fan club". He is, we learn, "the king of junk, racketeering and prostitution. He kills a dozen people per year" and makes big headlines.

At the cinema, some cosmopolitan directors have also very classically projected the guilt of their fellow Jews upon others. In Roger Hanin's film (real name: "Levy"), *The Protector* (1974), Nathalie, an 18-year old girl, disappears in the middle of Paris. To find her, her father, Samuel Malakian – a poor Jew – enters the White Slave trade directed by an aristocrat, Baron Metzger.

Take another look at the film *Vice Squad*, by "Jean Rougeron" (1987); Severine, 18 years old, falls into the hands of a pimp. Alarmed by her disappearance, her loved ones alert the vice squad. The inquiry orients the police to a White Slave network, the "Horsch" network. These villains kidnap girls to resell them to very rich foreigners.

These are all Nazis, Germans, tall, blond, with blue eyes.

In the same register, Steven Spielberg's film on the slave trade, *Amistad* (USA, 1997), does not show the dominant role played by Jewish merchants in this tragedy (see the chapter in *The Jewish Mafia*) and throws all the weight of the ignominy onto Christians.

## The Organ Traffic

The organ traffic was the topic of a scandal during the summer of 2009. On 24 July, in the United States, about forty local representatives and five rabbis were arrested in New Jersey, and several synagogues were searched. The authorities suspected the suspects of corruption, extortion, money laundering, and... organ trafficking. Rabbi Levy Izhak Rosenbaum was accused of persuading Moldovan donors to sell their kidneys for 10,000 dollars, so as to resell them for 16 times as much in the USA and Israel. "He targeted vulnerable people", stated Mark MacCarron, substitute Federal prosecutor. Rosenbaum took care of all the formalities required to cover the donor's trip to New York, where the operation took place. It turned out that Rosenbaum was the principal intermediary of Ilan Peri, who remained in Israel, and who was the brains of the operation.

In January 2004, already, a retired Israeli army officer named Geldaya Tauber Gady was arrested in Brazil for his participation in an international organ trafficking network. He then explained to the court that the operation was financed by the Israeli government. The fact is that the Israelis do not donate their organs for religious reasons. Israel is thus the only country in which the medical profession does not condemn the illegal traffic in organs, and where no action is taken against physicians who engage in the practice.

In 2003, Ilan Peri, 52 years old, was indicted in a network discovered in South Africa. It had performed at least one hundred kidney transplants. The operations, which benefited the Israelis, had taken place at the Saint Augustine clinic in Durban. The donors, in turn, were poor Brazilians from the region of Recife, who were paid up to 100,000 dollars per kidney. But the rates dropped quickly: to 3000 dollars.

Mike Levinski, an Israeli citizen, was the pioneer of the Moldovan network. The 15 February 2002 issue of *Le Point*, a weekly newspaper, provides some information on this traffic. We learn that the Moldovans, citizens of a small country located between Rumania and the Ukraine, were quite poor, and some of them were reduced to selling a kidney to survive. Israeli racketeers prospected on the spot, offering donors 3000 dollars for their "*pound of flesh*". The commission received by the racketeers amounted to 30,000 dollars per kidney, while the surgeon's fees amounted to 100,000 to 200,000 dollars per operation. Donors and patients found themselves in Turkey in the clinic of Dr. Sonmez, who admitted practicing more than 500 transplants over the past 5 years,

without ever being bothered by the Turkish police. The traffic was obviously extremely profitable, judging by the number of small ads of intermediaries published in the Israeli press.

The “donors” were not always aware of what was happening to them. After benign operations, for appendicitis or something similar, performed on young Moldovans, they woke up with scars in the wrong places. They were then informed that it had been necessary to remove a kidney which was not functioning properly, or that, as was the case with Serghei, an X-ray later revealed that their surgeon had simply stolen their kidney.

Nancy Scheper-Hughes, of the University of California, the specialist in this field, visited villages in Moldova where, she wrote, “20% of the adult men had been recruited to be kidney vendors”.

In December 2001, the Israeli newspaper Haaretz reported that the Rumanian ambassador in Israel had demanded to be received by the Minister of Social Affairs to discuss the topic of what was beginning to be a scandal in his country. On this occasion, we learn, he demanded explanations and had given the Ministry a list of children born in Rumania who had been brought to Israel to be adopted, “*with all their organs inside their bodies*”. It therefore seems that the adoption of Rumanian infants in Israel is perhaps not just a work of charity.

The “Rabbi Rosenbaum Affair” reopened the case. At the end of 2009, the Swedish journalist Donald Bolström, after an on-the-spot investigation, accused the Israeli army of taking organs from Palestinian prisoners. On the Internet, tongues loosened. Israeli doctors from the medico-legal legal institute of Abou Kabir were accused of having extracted the vital organs (heart, kidneys, liver) from young Palestinians killed by the Israeli army in Gaza or the West Bank. The bodies were sometimes returned to the families, stuffed with cotton and stitched up from top to bottom, but usually guarded in numbered tombs.

During an interview on the *Al-Jazira* TV channel, the former Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat accused the Israelis of murdering infants and young Palestinians so as to collect their vital organs for transplant purposes. “*They murdered our children and used their organs like the recycling of spare parts. Why did the world remain silent? Israel benefits from this silence to intensify its oppression and terror against our people*”, Arafat charged. Over the course of this interview, which was held on 14 January 2002, Arafat showed photographs of mutilated children.

In early October 2009, it was revealed that the network of rabbi Rosenbaum was also operating in Morocco. Pr. Mustapha Khiarti, president of the National Foundation for the promotion of health and

research and development, revealed that the network specialized in kidnapping children in Algeria. The operations were performed in Moroccan clinics located in Oujda. Rabbi Rosenbaum concerned himself with the financing to acquire the necessary equipment for the surgical operations, and the transport of the organs to New York.

In July 2009, we learned that at Bucharest, in Rumania, three persons had been arrested on charge of trafficking in human ova, this time. The two persons responsible for the Sabyc clinic, a father and son, were Israelis. Two other Israelis who worked in this clinic were also booked. The clinic paid the donors sums between 800 to 1,000 lei (approximately 190 to 238 euro), while Rumanian law strictly prohibited the payment for the donation of organs or cells. According to the Rumanian media, most of the recipients were Israelis. They paid between twelve and fifteen thousand euro for the performance of fertilization in vitro. The ovules originated from young Rumanian women in situations of social difficulty.

Accusatory inversion is seen here in a film called *Dirty Pretty Things* (Britain, 2002): Okwe is a poor black of Nigerian origin who lives in London, England. He is an illegal immigrant, and life is not easy. But he works hard to survive. He works as a taxi driver by day and receptionist at night, in a London hotel. But strange things start happening in the hotel, and Okwe discovers that the hotel where he works is just a front for an organ dealing operation, orchestrated by the person responsible for that floor, who exploits poverty-stricken immigrants. In exchange for a kidney, poor Third World immigrants are promised a passport or a visa: a kidney for a passport. The operation is performed in one of the suites in the hotel by inexperienced physicians. Persecuted by the immigration services (two white Englishmen – very evil people), Okwe does not dare report what he knows. So he attempts to dismantle the traffic by other means, assisted by a Turkish cleaning lady, a black prostitute and a Chinaman working in a morgue. The poor clandestine immigrants (“*undocumented aliens*”) are the victims of blackmail, pressure, rape and crimes, while the bad guys, once again, are whites. The film was produced by the director Stephen Frears, who is a “*white man*”, as you may have guessed...

See *The Believers* (USA, 1987). In this film (do doubt you were expecting this): at New York, young children are kidnapped and serve as victims of ritual sacrifice. The psychologist Jamison discovered the existence of a sect, Santeria, practicing a Cuban variant of voodoo. The film is by John Schlesinger, who is not a member of any voodoo sect...

In the film by Peter Webber, *Hannibal Lector, the Origins of Evil* (2007), which unveils the childhood of the cannibal psychopathic killer



of *The Silence of the Lambs* we see, in one scene, that a child killer can also be a good Christian, who is anxious for his own children to go to church.

It may be a bit easier to understand now why Jewish intellectuals, as a whole, are fiercely opposed to the death penalty. It is not just the fruit of philosophical reflection, but, rather, of a well-understood self-interest...

## VII

# The Destruction of the Traditional Family

### The Defense of Homosexuality

To Sigmund Freud, the founder of psychoanalysis, bisexuality was inherent in each human being. After him, it was chiefly Jewish intellectuals who have been at the vanguard of the homosexual movement. “Ant-Semites” quite correctly accuse them of contributing to the dissolution of the traditional family, but one must understand that this militant homosexuality is above all a manifestation of one facet of the Jewish identity. The omnipresence of “cosmopolitan” Jewish intellectuals in television, in film, as well as in bookstores and exhibitions is any case the only explanation for the exponential increase in the social and financial power of homosexuals in all “*democratic*” societies. You can look at the problem from every other possible angle: there is simply no other explanation. Jewish, and often homosexual, film makers have also largely contributed to the acceptance and trivialisation of deviancy.

*Bruno* (USA, 2009), for example, is an “*irritating*”, “*disturbing*” film by Sacha Baron Cohen. It is the fantastic story of an Austrian homosexual journalist who decides to become a “*shtar*” in Los Angeles...

*Spring Fever* (China, 2009), a film by the Chinese national Lou Ye, is a “*burning film about homosexuality in China*”, we are told by the newspaper *Le Monde*. The film, selected by the Cannes Festival and subsidized by the Region Ile-de-France, was produced by Sylvain Burztein.

*The Comrades* (France, 2006), shows a group of friends after the Liberation. They are all communists and members of the Party. Everything is going well, until the homosexuality of one of the “comrades” is discovered by the hierarchy. The declared intention of Sephardic director Francois Luciani was to denounce the intolerance which existed in the Stalinist party at the orders of a USSR which became “*reactionary*” following the elimination of “*cosmopolitan*”

elements”.

Directors like Edouard Molinaro (*Mariage Blanc*, *La Cage aux Folles*), Alain Berliner (see the series *Clara Scheller*, 2004), Cedric Klapisch (*The Spanish Apartment*, also known as *Pot Luck* 2002), Olivier Dahan, Sebastien Lifshitz, Dominique Baron, Claude Miller, Jean-Jacques Zilbermann and many others, have contributed to the trivialisation of this phenomenon.

Among the films known to the general public, we may cite *Soft Pedal* (1996), by Gabriel Aghion: a film on the world of gay and transvestite clubs. Then again, there is *French Twist* by Josiane Balasko (1994), the story of a lesbian who insinuates herself into the life of a couple: the husband finishes by agreeing to a *menage à trois*. “*A provocative comedy of morals which questions the received notions on love and sexuality*”.

Above all, there are the “*American*” films: see, for example, *Far from Heaven* (2002): in a bourgeois suburb in the America of the 1950s, a woman discovers “shady areas” in the life of her husband, who turns out to be homosexual. Quite happily, our beautiful American comforts herself with her gardener: a big strong Black who knows how to take care of her – according to the magic formula of, “*homosexuality for the white man; race-mixing for the white woman*”. The film, by Todd Haynes, was naturally rewarded by four Oscar nominations: “*A pure diamond*”, according to *Les Inrock* (Serge Kaganski); “*Disturbing, a masterpiece*”, exclaimed the magazine *Zurban*. The director Todd Haynes is, in fact, Jewish through his mother.

*American Beauty* (1999) is a well-made film, but exceptional for the extent of its perversion: in a neat little suburb of an American city, a couple are quarrelling violently. So the woman has an affair with a real estate promoter. Their new neighbour, a professional soldier with “*Extreme Right Wing*” views who regularly beats his son with the greatest brutality, discovers his own latent homosexuality. Homosexuality is once again shown with indulgence in the furtive appearance of another neighbourhood couple, who appear to be the only happy couple in the district. The magic formula in this film is: defense of adultery, drugs, homosexuality, paedophile and incestuous ambiguity; and denunciation of the “*Extreme Right*”: we are certainly dealing with a “*cosmopolitan*” film. Directed by Sam Mendes, the film naturally won five Oscars. “*Ironical, provocative and disturbing*”, we read in other reviews.

Jewish intellectuals actually brag about being “*irritating*”, “*provocative*” and “*disturbing*”, but are astonished and become indignant at the persistence of “*anti-Semitism*”! This, again, is another

“paradox”.

*In and Out* (1997), is a comedy. A university professor, who wishes to disprove the rumour that he is homosexual, decides to get married quickly to his fiancée. And here is the final scene: during the diploma awarding ceremony, students and parents learn with stupefaction that the professor has been fired. They all get up one by one to declare that they are all “gay”. The film is signed Frank Oz. There are many other examples of this genre. As early as 1962, the famous William Wilder outdid himself with the film *The Children’s Hour*, in which he denounced Puritanism, and posed as an apostle of the “liberation” of morals.

The ambiguity of identity is found, once again, in the film by the director Arthur Penn, *Little Big Man* (USA, 1970). It is the story of a white man who has been raised among Cheyenne Indians since the age of ten, and who is thrown back and forth, depending on circumstances, between the camp of the wicked White men and that of the loveable, peaceful Indians. A homosexual Indian character, inverted in more ways than one, is also highly symbolic of the ambiguity of identity in Judaism.

## Cross-Dressers and Transsexuals

An obsession with cross-dressers and transsexuals may also be noted among “cosmopolitan” film directors.

In *Russian Dolls* (France, 2005), Cedric Klepisch offers us a sequel to *The Spanish Apartment*. Once again, the film depicts lesbianism (between white women), with the added touch of race-mixing (white man and black woman), cocaine consumption, and a transvestite scene.

*Chouchou* (2003), is a film by Algerian-born Merzak Allouache: Chouchou, a young Maghrebin, disembarks illegally at Paris in search of his nephew. The latter has become “Vanessa”, a romantic singer in a cabaret. Chouchou decides to become a transvestite as well, during his free time. The film is the product of the imagination of his script-writer, Gad Elmaleh, who plays the main role, and who is not Algerian.

In this genre, we also have *All About My Mother*, by Pedro Almodovar (Spain, 1999), a story of transsexuals and transvestites. Almodovar is also pleased to show us a very multicultural Spain, which is, yet again, very typical. The film, produced by Michel Ruben, was made available on DVD by Claude Berri (Langmann).

Almodovar was naturally rewarded by the Cannes Film Festival in 1999 as “*The Best Director*”. “*I dedicate this reward to Spanish*

*democracy. I experienced religious fundamentalism, police brutality and the hatred of difference*”, he explains.

Among famous directors, we must cite Sydney Pollack, with his film *Tootsie* (USA, 1983): Dorsey, a serious, hard-working comedian, is unemployed. To get a role, he dresses up as a woman and becomes “Tootsie”. As early as 1959, In *Some Like it Hot*, Billy Wilder told the story of cross-dressers, in an admittedly funny comedy.

Two unemployed jazz musicians, involuntarily mixed up in a feud between gangsters, disguise themselves as female musicians in order to escape. They start out in Florida with a female orchestra, and straight away fall in love with a ravishing woman (Marylene) who wants to marry a billionaire.

Of course, not all films on homosexuality, cross-dressing and transsexuals are the work of Jews exclusively. *Evening Dress* (1986), for example, was directed by Bertrand Blier, who was not a Jew, but was perhaps heavily influenced by his wife (Anouk Grinberg).

Before the Second World War, the precursor of all modern studies of homosexuals and transvestites was the sexologist Magnus Hirschfeld (1868-1935), founder of the first “gay” political movement, in 1897. In 1920, he founded a “*sexology institute*” in Berlin which acquired an “*international reputation*”. A homosexual, Jew and socialist, Magnus Hirschfeld was compelled to flee Germany in 1933.

## **Feminism**

The famous feminist Elisabeth Badinter intends to make tabula rasa with the past and destroy the family basis of European civilization: “*Rethinking masculinity is an urgent need*”, she writes (*XY: On Masculine Identity*, 1992). “*The idea is to give birth to a uni-sex human being*”. Elisabeth Badinter worships “*the clairvoyant discourse of the Viennese feminist Rosa Mayreder*”, who advocated “*the synthesis of the masculine and feminine for individuals liberated from their sexual characteristics*”. Let us recall that Elisabeth Badinter is the daughter of billionaire advertising king Bleustein-Blanchet (of the Publicis Group, biggest worldwide). Badinter was the wife of the Mitterand’s Minister of Justice.

Once again, this is the egalitarian fanaticism of Judaism: always this same obsession with levelling all differences between human beings. Feminists claim that there are “*no differences between the sexes*”, just as the Marxists used to assure us that “*social classes would be abolished*”, and the democracies promised us a “*world without*

borders” which resemble a mixed-race humanity. The objective is always the same: the dissolution of identities, whether sexual, social or national, and the coagulation of the atomic particles so as to unify the world and work for the advent of definitive “peace” on earth, which would be the “peace of Israel”: (*solve et coagula*); obviously, everything else must be broken down first before anything can be built up.

In the United States, the four most important figures in radical feminism since World War Two were Jewish women: Betty Friedan, who founded the first large-scale feminist movement in the United States (NOW: National Organization for Women); Bella Abzug, Gloria Steinem, and Gloria Allred. In France, Jewish women also headed the movement after the war: Anne Tristan (Zelansky) created the association *Feminine-Masculine-Future* in 1968; Gisele Halimi was also one of the leading figures of militant feminism. Born in Tunisia in 1927, her real name was Zeilza Gisele Elise Taieb. A lawyer, she cut her teeth on Communism, demonstrated for Algerian independence, untiringly denouncing the French army and colonialism. In 1971, she founded the feminist movement with Simone de Beauvoir and militated with Simone Veil for “*abortion rights for French women*”. She was also one of the founders of the world globalization movement *Attac*. In 2006, she was promoted to the *Légion d’Honneur*.

These militants played a primary role in the adoption of measures for the legalization of abortion. In the United States, the great birth control pioneer Margaret Sanger; abortion was legalized in 1973. Then it was Germany’s turn in 1974, followed by France in 1975, under the influence of another Jewish woman: Simone Veil. We should recall here that the “father” of modern divorce laws in France in 1882 was another Jew named Alfred Naquet.

The consequences of all these measures of cultural revolution and subversion upon the European birth rate did not take long to make themselves apparent, all the more so since the limitation of births was further encourage by the invention of the “abortion pill” RU 486. The abortion pill, perfected by Professor Etienne Beaulieu, made billions for the Roussel-Uclaf trust and its “*genius*” inventor. Was this an accident? Professor “Beaulieu” was also a Jew. Born in Strasbourg on 12 December 1926, he was the son of Leonce Blum, born in Alsace, who was the son of the rabbi Felix Blum. After the Popular Front, the Blum family name was unpopular, so much so that Blum applied to change his name, which was accorded by decree in 1947, after which the family called themselves “Beaulieu”.

## The Destruction of All Patriarchy

The destruction of the nuclear family, the basis for traditional European society, is one of the major themes of cosmopolitan thought. “*Women’s Liberation*”, unrestrained by the restrictions of the patriarchal family, was prepared for long in advance by film. So many films contributed to the “*liberation*” of European women that it would be impossible to count them all. In *Whatever Works* (USA, 2009), for example, the director Woody Allen transmogrifies a Christian couple: the wife becomes addicted to sexual orgies, while the husband becomes a blossoming homosexual!

It should be recalled at this point that the pornography industry is very largely the work of Jewish entrepreneurs and “artists”. It would be impossible to provide a summary here, but you may consult the book *The Jewish Mafia* (2008).

After the Second World War, the “Freudian-Marxist” current was at the head of the “*liberation of morals*” movement and the “*sexual revolution*”; essentially, a simple combination of Freud and Marx. Wilhelm Reich, Herbert Marcuse, Erich Fromm, Theodore Wieselth, Adorno were this movement’s most illustrious representatives; all were Jews. The family, wrote Wilhelm Reich, was an “*authoritarian state in miniature*”. If one wishes to destroy a nation, one must also, logically, destroy the traditional family, since the authoritarian family is the reproductive cell of reactionary thought, bullying the “*individual*” through the repression of “*infantile sexuality*”. “*Cosmopolitan*” thinkers are literally obsessed by “*infantile sexuality*”.

## VIII

# The Psychopathology of “Anti-Semitism”

### Rapists and Psychos

In our books, we have compiled numerous cases of physicians or psychiatrists who raped their patients. The press regularly reports these incidents, but one must read between the lines. Here are a few recent scandals: on 7 February 2007, Roger Chemoul, 61, was sentenced to 5 years in prison by the criminal court at Rhône. Roger Chemoul was prosecuted for raping a nurse who worked in the same retirement home with him, in Tarare, France, in 2003.

In November 2007, Andre Hazout, a famous Parisian gynaecologist, who was also an international leading authority on fertilization in vitro, was indicted for some obviously exaggerated gynaecological examinations.

See again the Thierry Chichportrich scandal, the “masseur to the stars”, nicknamed “The Man with the Golden Fingers” by the elite of the film world. On 20 May 2006, he was sentenced to 18 years in prison by the criminal court of Nice for the rape of 13 young girls whom he first anaesthetised.

Gilbert Tordjmann was the founder and “Pope” of French sexology. When he was finally indicted in March 2002, 44 former patients appeared to testify, claiming to have been abused by the great “*specialist*”.

We have compiled numerous cases of this kind in the United States, particularly in the fields of psychiatry and psychoanalysis (see our book entitled *Jewish Fanaticism*, 2007). Psychiatrists, who make up only 6% of all physicians in America, make up 28% of all practitioners punished for crimes of a sexual nature. Between 10 and 25% of mental health practitioners were said to have abused their patients. As early as the 19th century, some newspapers in Central Europe warned young women against abuse by “*psychoanalysts*”.



## Sexual Crimes Against Children

Paedophilia in the Jewish community is much more widespread than it appears. The media pass over the problem in silence and accuse Catholic priests. In reality, the phenomenon is incomparably more important within the Jewish sect, particularly among Orthodox Jews. We have compiled innumerable testimonies and legal proceedings since the publication of *The Psychoanalysis of Judaism*, in 2006.

In the United States, an Internet site – the Awareness Center – listed hundreds of rabbis, both Israeli and American, persecuted for sexual attacks on children. The site, unfortunately, no longer exists, but we compiled a few of these cases in the chapters of our books (*The Psychoanalysis of Judaism*, *The Mirror of Judaism*). Each week, the American and Israeli press provides us with new examples. In December 2011, the umpteenth scandal erupted in the Orthodox Jewish community of Brooklyn, where the New York City Police Department investigated charges of sexual abuse brought by no fewer than 117 children. 85 people were arrested in this one case.

In January 2012, the rabbi Daniel Fahri, eminent founder of the Jewish liberal movement of France, was indicted for similar misdeeds. This Daniel Fahri was also the father of rabbi Gabriel Fahri, who had been much talked about in 2003, who claimed to have been attacked with knives in a Paris street. Police investigations very quickly established that the rabbi had stabbed himself. (We have listed numerous cases of similar affairs in *Jewish Fanaticism*).

These sexual deviations are explained in part by the content of the Talmud, the holy book of Judaism, which contains the teachings of the rabbis, and which the Jews consider more important than the Torah. We have already studied this question in our books. Let us summarize the essential facts here:

The Sanhedrin treatise (54b-55a) teaches that as long as children have not reached sexual maturity, they are not physiologically capable of having sexual relations, are not considered persons, and the laws on sodomy do not apply to them. Many pages are dedicated to the description of paedophilia and “*cohabitation*” with young children. Sanhedrin 55a clearly establishes that a boy is considered sexually mature at age 9 years and 1 day, and a little girl at the age of 3 years and 1 day.

In France, very well known personalities have defended paedophilia in their books. Daniel Cohn-Bendit, former “68” leader, or the TV announcer Michel Polac, for example. We have long been aware of the morals of former Minister of Culture, Jack Lang, who

declared in the newspaper *Gay Pied* on 31 January 1991: “*The sexuality of children is still a forbidden continent. It is the task of the discoverers of the 21st century to approach the shores*”. In September 2009, at the time of the arrest of the film director Roman Polanski, all Jewish intellectuals defended the paedophile as one man: Bernard-Henry Levi, Claude Lelouch, Constantin Costa-Gavras, etc. Even Frédéric Mitterrand got involved. It is necessary, once again, to note the convergences between Judaism and the “*sexual minorities*”.

## IX

### At Last: Psychoanalysis Explained

The question of incest is a nagging one among Jewish intellectuals. Direct testimonies are rather rare, due to the fact that incest victims are highly reluctant to discuss the matter, and very few victims bring charges against their own parents. But if we read the Jews with a mirror, we will soon see that this whole problem is an absolute obsession in the cultural production of Judaism. Jewish intellectuals and film makers always talk about it with an air of great mystery, in an anecdotal way, or by projecting the problem onto a universal level, always using a goy family as an example. We know that the Jewish people love to encourage an air of mystery and secrecy, and that incest, in particular, is one of the secrets, if not *the* top secret of Judaism. In our books *The Psychoanalysis of Judaism* (2006), *Jewish Fanaticism* (2007), and *The Mirror of Judaism* (2009), various chapters show that the near-totality of Jewish intellectuals, artists and film-makers have dealt with the problem at one time or another, usually via the mechanism of “*projection*”. This is not an accident.

Of course, incest is formally proscribed among Jews, as stipulated by the Torah (Leviticus 18) and the Babylonian Talmud (Yabamot 2a). But the interpretations of Jewish intellectuals are always ambiguous.

Everything is ambiguous in Judaism. Ambiguity may even be said to constitute the principal characteristic of Judaism. In the case in question, one must observe that the Jews know how to rationalize their war around the Biblical texts.

See for example, the film *Chinatown*, by Roman Polanski (USA, 1974): at Los Angeles, in the 1930s, a drought compels small farmers to sell their land. The land is purchased at rock-bottom prices by large landowners with the connivance of the municipality, which releases the badly needed, precious water over a spillway every night. Jack Nicholson, private detective, investigates the affair, which displeases powerful enemies. At the end of the film, the beautiful Faye Dunaway, slapped by Nicholson, finally admits that the little girl she has been hiding from everyone is both her daughter and her sister. Her father is a monster, a rich landowner. This is a typical example of the manner in which an intimate and highly sensitive, almost uniquely Jewish

problem is projected onto the *goyim*, by a Jew who is a child rapist himself, Roman Polanski. Examples of this genre are very numerous.

Incest may also be depicted as occurring between father and son. Director and actor Tim Roth, for example, has admitted being abused by his own father. In his film *The War Zone* (Great Britain, 1999) he denounces the incestuous relations between a father and his daughter. The horror finally ends when Tom and his sister stab their father to death.

An article in the Israeli newspaper *Haaretz*, on 13 December 2006, reports interesting statistics. We learn that Israel, over the course of the year, received more than 2,000 complaints alleging the sexual abuse of children under the age of 12, and nearly 2,500 others concerning adolescents aged between 13 and 18 years. 90% of the victims were attacked by someone they knew; 60% of the cases involving children below the age of 12 were incestuous relationships. One must remember that, in the immense majority of cases, the victims of incest never bring charges.

In the film *They Live*, (USA, 1988), by John Carpenter, the hero, Nada, thanks to special glasses, discovers that a small part of the population consists of extra-terrestrials who look like everybody else, constituting an elite which governs the world through lies. Nada (“nothing”, in Spanish) we learn, was the victim of an abusive father.

Some mention must be made at this point of the famous “*Jewish mother*”, which means an over-possessive, abusive mother. Jacques Attali, Bernard-Henry Levi, Romain Gary, Alain Finkielkraut and many others have left more than just a few ambiguous testimonies on this subject. This is what Elie Wiesel wrote on the subject, in *Talmudic Celebration* (1991): A woman visits Rabbi Yeoshoua. “*So what’s the problem?*”

*Here it is: ‘B’nai hakatan mibni hagadol’, she says, “my younger son’s father is my older son”. [...] Jewish mothers are always guilty of what happens to their beloved children”.*

Wiesel puts it elliptically: “*As a good Jewish son, he loved his mother – a little bit too much*”.

The philosopher Alain Finkielkraut felt the need to see a psychiatrist: “*My fears and problems were no doubt a result of our frenzied intimacy... whether it was irritation or just weariness, it has happened to me to be weak and offer my Jewishness to psychoanalysis*”. Finkielkraut himself writes: “*Hysterical, I had become Jewish to make people look at me*”.

The American novelist Philip Roth, in *Portnoy’s Complaint* (1967), also “*let go*” a little (cf. *Jewish Fanaticism*): “*Please, who crippled us*

so? *Who made us so morbid, so hysterical and weak? ... Doctor, what do you call this sickness I have? Is it the Jewish suffering which I used to hear so much about?... My own mother... Her beloved, she calls me!*" Jewish mothers, "in love" with their sons, no doubt imagine that they have given birth to the long-awaited Messiah of Israel. And Philip Roth adds, sickened, "*What was it with these Jewish parents, what, that they were able to make us little Jewish boys believe that we were little princes on the other hand, unique as unicorns on the one hand, geniuses and brilliant like nobody had ever been brilliant and beautiful before in the whole history of childhood?*"

The feminist Elisabeth Badinter explains (*XY: On Masculine Identity*, 1992), that this is all quite natural: "*The good mother is naturally incestuous and paedophile. Nobody would ever dream of complaining of it, but they all wish to forget it, including the mother and son*".

There are many glimpses of this type in cosmopolitan cinema. In 1997, the Jewish director Milos Forman presented *Larry Flynt*, a film on the scandalous life of a pornographic magazine tycoon who became the flag-bearer of the struggle against the moral order in the United States. We see this "Pope" of porn (represented as a *goy*) persecuted by the representatives of the "moral order" for caricaturizing the moral order in his magazine and claiming to have had sex with his own mother in a toilet. Here again, accusatory inversion is the norm. In France, Catholic associations were successful in bringing about the withdrawal of the film poster, which represented a man being crucified on a woman's pubis.

Incestuous relations between brother and his sister are made to appear rather common, at least judging by the cultural production of Jewish cinema. References to incest are seen to be very numerous in film as soon as one starts paying attention. Here are a few: in *Land of Light* (2008), director Stephane Kurc projects a history of incest between brother and sister among the French in Algeria, in a film dripping with anti-*goy* racism. There is also the film *Disengagement* by Israeli director Amos Gitai (2007); *Kika* by Pedro Almodovar (Spain, 1993), In *Brotherhood of the Wolf* (2001), Christophe Gans shows us the rape of a sister by her brother. The film is also very "anti-racist": an Iroquois Indian beats the stuffing out of a load of French peasants, in the 18th century!

In the novel by Jonathan Littell entitled *The Kindly Ones* (Goncourt Prize 2006), the hero is a homosexual SS officer, madly in love with his twin sister Una. This is a clear case of accusatory inversion, traditional among Jewish intellectuals.

The novelist Isaac Bashevis Singer also projects his guilt onto others. In his novel entitled *Scum*, published in 1991, we read: “*In Argentina, Peru, in Bolivia, Chile and elsewhere, little girls are raped by their fathers, brothers sleep with their sisters, mothers have sex with their own sons. People do not always put a stop to such crimes. They go talk to the priest, confess, and they are absolved with a little holy water.*”

In his book *On Anti-Semitism*, Stéphane Zagdanski himself warns us that the reader will have to “*decode*” his remarks and put the following sentence in the right place. With reference to “*anti-Semites*”, he writes: “*To be decoded: they are egotistically addicted to this obscure enjoyment of incest, access to which is prohibited to them. Anti-Semites, you understand, are very greatly disturbed by incest, which is logical, since they suffer from a lack of boundaries.*”

Incest, as we see, is an absolute obsession among Jews. Mother and son, father and daughter, brother and sister, uncles and daughters, etc. ... there are what are called “*stovepipe*” families, in which everybody “*fits*” into everybody else, from generation to generation. There is no doubt an urgent need for an official inquiry into the problem to provoke a discussion, intended to break the succession of “*incestuous generations*”.

At this point, there can no longer be any talk of any “Chosen People”; what the Jews need is a medical diagnosis. The “German poet”, Heinrich Heine, had the habit of declaring sardonically that Judaism is not a religion, but a “*family misfortune*” (*Familienunglück*). Freud himself no doubt also understood that the origin of Judaism is not religious in nature, but sexual. But he lacked the courage to reveal to the world at large that the famous “*Oedipus complex*” was in reality nothing by an “*Israel complex*”, preferring to project the neurosis of Judaism onto humanity as a whole. One must always read the Jews with a mirror.

## The Myth of the Oedipus Complex

The father of psychoanalysis built his theories based on the study of hysterical pathology, which was obviously no accident. Based on his personal case history and on a study of and his fellow Viennese Jews, he showed that incest was the major cause of hysteria.

In 1896, Freud categorically supported the notion that the specific cause of hysteria must be sought in some sort of sexual problem. Thirteen cases analysed by him permitted him to arrive at this

conclusion. Hysteria, he affirmed, was caused by a serious incident of a sexual nature, passively experienced and occurring before puberty.

What his biographer Ernst Jones writes is edifying, as long as one understands that we are only speaking of the Jewish community: *“From May 1893, the time in which he speaks for the first time to Fliess, in September 1897... he admitted that a sexual seduction committed against a child by an adult – most often the father – was the essential cause of hysteria. The proofs provided by the analytical materials seemed irrefutable. For more than four years, his conviction remained unshakeable, although the frequency of these so-called incidents surprised him more and more. Everything appeared to indicate that a great number of fathers were addicted to the commission of incestuous crimes... Freud concluded that, judging by certain symptoms observable in his brother and a few of his sisters, his father might have been guilty, too”* (letter to Fliess, 11 February 1897).

In this letter, as Freud wrote to his great friend, Dr. Wilhem Fliess, *“Unfortunately, my own father was one of these perverts: he is the cause of my brother’s hysteria (whose condition I am still striving to diagnose), and some of my younger sisters...”*

In 1897, however, after his father’s death, which occurred at the end of October 1896, Freud abandoned the *“seduction theory”* and adopted the *“fantasy theory”*: hysterical women were no longer the unfortunate victims of incest committed against them during their childhood, but were now merely fantasizing about their fathers! His father was henceforth washed clean of any suspicion. Parents were no longer guilty. It was now necessary to believe that the children were in love with their parent of the opposite sex and desired incestuous relations.

Ernst Jones writes here: *“During the winter following the death of his father (more precisely, in February), Freud accused his father of acts of seduction; three months later (on 31 May 1897), an incestuous dream he had put an end to his doubts relating to the seduction story”*.

In his letters of 3, 4, and 15 October 1897, Freud described the progress of his self-analysis and acknowledged *“his father’s innocence”* – or so it would appear. Ernst Jones appears satisfied with this explanation and supported the Freudian hypothesis: *“What is important above all, more than the parent’s incestuous desires, even more than occasional acts of this kind, was the general fact of incestuous desires inspired in the child by the parent of the opposite sex”*. Et voilà: *“infantile sexuality”* and the *“Oedipus complex”* were born!

Freud was obviously the object of very heavy pressure from his

fellow Jews while he was still in the process of constructing his theories on the origins of hysteria, so as to avoid revealing to the world the heavy secret of Judaism. By inventing the theory of the “Oedipus complex”, he concealed the reality of incest within Jewish families while exculpating Jewish parents. And he covered his tracks even further by projecting this Jewish specificity onto a universal plane, through the mechanism of a Greek hero (Oedipus). In reality, the famous “*Oedipus complex*” is in reality and above all nothing more than an “*Israel complex*”, i.e., the complex of a son who has slept with his own mother, and who wishes to “kill his father”, for quite understandable reasons.

We nevertheless owe it to Freud for raising the question of incest, which is the one true great secret of Judaism. The only thing we need to do now is place this “*psychoanalytic theory*” in front of a mirror, which will then reflect the following conclusion: “*Judaism is the illness which psychoanalysis sets out to cure*”. Everything written by Jews must be read with a mirror. The truth is that everything they ever say about others and about “*humanity*” is, at bottom, nothing but the reflection of themselves.

After Freud, psychoanalysts replaced priests in caring for the souls of the faithful. The only difference, really – from the Jewish point of view – was that while priests were free of charge, while psychoanalysts demand to be paid cash on the barrel head! Or possibly credit card. Just the same, it’s a little bit comical to see all these “*sick people*” (the phrase is from Jacques Attali) forming the heavy battalions of all those who set out to cure humanity of its ills. But this is just one of the “paradoxes” of Judaism. The truth is that Jewish psychoanalysts don’t just practice their profession to treat their patients; rather, they treat their patients to try to treat themselves.

Typically, in claiming that the origin of neurosis were to be found in the repression of sexual impulses by Christian morality, Freud was, once again – and, once again, typically – deliberately projecting his own neurosis – and the neurosis of Judaism – onto a civilization which he consciously hated. He himself warned us, in embarking for America: “*They do not know that we are bringing them the plague*”.



## X

### The Hysterical Sect

On the individual level, hysteria is very common in the Jewish community, more than in any other. But in reality, it is Judaism as a whole, the Jewish “mission” with universal pretensions, in its various political, intellectual and artistic expressions, which appears to be an expression of hysteria. Here we find the pathology common to all the ingredients of intellectual Judaism: egocentrism, histrionics, introspection, anguish, emotional fragility, a tendency to dramatize, manipulation, paranoia, a “*great intolerance of frustration*”, plasticity of identity, the idea of a “mission”, selective amnesia, fantasizing, over-abundant imagination, frequent suicides: everything in Judaism matches the symptoms of hysteria point by point; and we are not thinking of “*nervous pregnancy*” or the “*birth-pangs of the Messiah*”.

The same pathology which attracted the attention of Sigmund Freud is also characterized by an extremely great contagiousness: it is no wonder that the Jews are the great specialists in all those exercises in politico-religious delirium which regularly set humanity on fire. This can all summed up in ten words: *Judaism is the illness which psychoanalysis set out to cure*. Or in three words, if you prefer: *Jew = incest = hysteria*.

Many Jews who suffer from membership in this “*incestuous sect*” and who would like to find the strength free themselves, breaking the walls of the “*Jewish prison*” (the phrase is Jean Daniel’s), so as to become part of humanity. The American novelist Philip Roth gave very graphic expression to Jewish neurosis in several novels. The most representative passages are quoted in *Jewish Fanaticism* (2007).

In reply to the question of “*What is a Jew?*”, Nobel Prize Winner Isaac Bashevis Singer, interviewed in *The New York Times Magazine* of November 1978, replied: “*It is someone who, when he is unable to sleep, keeps everyone else from going to sleep*”.

## Need for Love

A study of the cultural production of Judaism shows that the Jews appear to suffer profoundly from the lack of love for them on the part of the rest of the world, which seems not to appreciate the mission of the “*Chosen People*”. The Jewish people are alone, very much alone, in the midst of the nations. “*The Jews are a people whom one must admire but who are very difficult to love*”, writes Nahum Goldmann.

Jewish directors thus compensate for this suffering by imagining the Jew finally recognized for what he is: a brilliant being, definitively a genius, who deserve to be worshipped with incense and applauded until the roof falls in. This image is found at the end of the film *The Last Metro* (France, 1980), by Francois “Truffaut” (Levy): Lucas Steiner, a theater director who was compelled to hide in a cave throughout the war, finally reveals himself to the public at the moment of the Liberation. Following a stage show, he goes up on the stage and is applauded frenetically by the delirious *goyim* who recognize his genius.

We find this image at the end of the Woody Allen film *Deconstructing Harry* (USA, 1997), the hero of the film, who is a novelist, is applauded at length by all the characters around him. Here again, the Jewish hero is welcome with a “*standing ovation*”. Woody Allen has once again expressed this need to be loved and recognized in *Zelig* (1983), which tells the story of a chameleon-man, already desiring to resemble “*the Other*”, to be loved (see, in particular, the chapter on the “*plasticity of identity*” and “*Jewish humour*” in *The Psychoanalysis of Judaism*, 2006).

Or again, the film *Barton Fink*, by the Cohen brothers (USA, 1991): at the beginning of the film, the young playwright is applauded frenetically by the entire hall, in delirium: it is the beginning of a great career in Hollywood.

In *Rollerball*, by Norman Jewison (USA, 1975), the action takes place in 2108; by this date, all nations have been abolished, and politicians have been replaced by technocrats. It is a whole civilization of leisure, with a game which impassions the planet: Jonathan (James Caan) is the most popular of these new heroes. The crowd chants his name wildly.

This image is found again in a short novel by Jacques Lanzmann, entitled *The Seventh Heaven* (1985). A certain “Moses” has the nerve to name his only pure-bred “*Long Live the Jews*”, so the crowds acclaim them both!

## Jewish Art

The Jews are hardly fascinated by the beauty of the world. Their inclination to permanent militancy, fed by the Messianic obsession of a “*world without borders*”, prevents them from simply seeing the world as it is and appreciating its beauty. In 1968, the novelist Albert Cohen, in *Her Lover (Belle du Seigneur)*, expressed this fact with great clarity: “*Israel is the people that combat the laws of nature, and the bearer of a crazy hope which nature abhors*”. And he continues, in the tone of a prophetic trance: “*Men’s noblest qualities are rooted in the Jewish soul and the rock on which they stand is the Bible O my lovely Jews to whom I speak in silence know your people Israel venerate your people for having sown schism and separation and for having taken up arms against nature and against nature’s laws*” (pp. 878-79).

The feminist Elisabeth Badinter has also expressed the Jewish inclination to go against the laws of nature: “*The hold of nature withdraws and, with it, the difference which separates the sexes*”. (*Man/Woman: The One Is the Other*, 1986). Edouard Valdman has also written: “*They will never again be the slaves of nature, of the nation, of repetition, of the soil*”.

The fact is that after three thousand years of history, Jewish artistic production has remained remarkably mediocre. Jews who have tried their hand at the plastic arts over the past few decades, transgressing the well-known Biblical proscription (“*thou shalt make no graven images*”), have presented the world with nothing but deformities, corresponding to the very essence of their imbalanced nature. Every one of their sculptures is each more twisted than the last; their paintings are hideously deformed. This is obviously why they take refuge in abstract art.

Jewish art does not therefore have as its function the distorting, or deliberately soiling, “Aryan” art, as maintained by a rather simplistic anti-Semitic orthodoxy: rather, it corresponds to a spirit, a mental universe, an imaginary world which is very specific to the incestuous sect of Judaism. All this is much less the sign of a desire to “*pervert*” what is beautiful, than it is the expression of a neurosis.

## The Jewish Prison

There are many novels depicting Jews in their attempts to escape from Judaism; in each case, the protagonist is compelled to return, drawn by

a mysterious force. In the contrary event, the hero is ineluctably compelled to commit suicide. This is the manner in which the rabbis and Jewish intellectuals attempt to compel the Jews to remain in their community. Henri Bean's film, *The Believer*, USA, 2001) is a very good illustration of this technique: Danny Balint is a young New York skinhead, ultra-violent and furiously anti-Semitic. He wants nothing to do with his family, with his "people", with their inept religion. Balint is a neo-Nazi, passionate and determined, who wears his swastika T-shirt with pride... until the day when, inevitably, the conflict of identity resurfaces and compels him inexorably to suicide. You really must see this film: it depicts what is commonly called "self-hatred", but which is, in reality, none other than a healthy awareness of Judaism's deep hostility towards the rest of humanity. Since the director himself forms part of this community, it is really no surprise that Danny's attempt to free himself is doomed to failure. One must in fact understand that the film is addressed, first and foremost, to the Jews themselves, so as to place them on guard against any attempts of this kind. The message of the film could be summarized as follows: "*It is useless to try to leave Judaism: you will not succeed*".

The novelist Isaac Bashevis Singer, in *The Crown of Feathers*, or the English novelist Israel Zangwill, in his short story *Joseph the Dreamer* (cf. *The Mirror of Judaism*, 2009), depict the conflict of identity characterising the Jewish personality and the determination of certain Jews to break the walls of the "Jewish prison".

This is how Jewish novelists shore up the myth of a Jewishness which is supposed to be inalterable. According to them, Jews who forget their Jewishness will be fated to witness its inevitable return, sooner or later, even several generations later. This is what could be called "*the myth of the incubating Jew*" (cf. *The Mirror of Judaism*). These stories are written to incite the Jews to remain within the fold; but ever since they left the ghetto, Jewish intellectuals have all had occasion to witness the manner in which hundreds of thousands of other Jews have successfully left the Jewish prison, forgetting Judaism once and for all. Nahum Goldman said: "*If a Jew no longer wishes to be a Jew, if he denies Judaism, if he gives his children no Jewish education, or if he baptizes them, then he can cease to be a Jew. This is why so many Jews have disappeared over the course of the centuries; otherwise, there would be hundreds of millions of us*".

Under these conditions, anti-Semitism is quite useful, since it tightens the ranks of the community. It also serves the purpose of attracting to the Jewish community any individual who might have discovered by chance a drop of Jewish blood in his veins. But this only

happens in the imagination of Jewish novelists: history records not one single known case of an “*anti-Semite*” who suddenly began to adore the “*Chosen People*” after discovering a remote Jewish ancestor. In truth, the result of such a discovery in one’s family tree is more likely to bring about a radicalization of anti-Semitic sentiment than anything else.

## The Symptoms of Insanity

In 1967, the famous Isaac Bashevis Singer published a novel entitled *The Manor*. The story takes place in pre-WWII Poland. “Bonifratov Hospital” is a lunatic asylum: “*There were an impressive number of Messiahs among the Jewish patients*”, writes Singer. We refer the reader here to our book *Jewish Fanaticism* (2007). Nor shall we cite here all the horror films we’ve seen depicting maniacs and bloodthirsty psychotics. At this point, we shall simply restrict ourselves to observing that, here again, this is an industry dominated by “*cosmopolitan*” film directors.

The film *Hostel* (USA, 2005), for example, tells the story of three American students on holiday, discovering Europe. They decide to visit Slovakia, a country full of promiscuous young girls, a country described as the paradise of debauchery. They arrive by train in a promising little Slovakian village, and are immediately seduced by enticing young beauties. But they have fallen into a trap: it will not be long before they experience true horror. An abandoned factory in the countryside has been transformed into an immense slaughterhouse for human flesh, in which the victims are tortured on all floors: with scissors, with pincers, with chain-saws! Western perverts pay high prices for this form of gratification, and the horrible Slovaks give them whatever they want! Obviously, the director Eli Roth does not like Slovaks very much; perhaps a case of bad conscience... Let us note as well that the film was produced by one of the director’s personal friends: Quentin Tarantino.

The inventor of “gore” cinema was a certain Herschell Gordon Lewis, who became well-known in 1963 by revolutionizing the horror film industry with his film *Blood Feast*. The same person was later arrested for fraud, putting an end to his career in “vomit films”.

Perhaps now it will be easier to understand why, in *One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest* (USA, 1975), Milos Forman attempted to convince us that madmen are not as crazy as all that; rather, they are the victims of an oppressive society.

## The Suicidal Jew

It is hardly surprising to find that some Jews take refuge in suicide rather than remain the prisoners of the incestuous sect of Judaism, whose lofty talk of “*universal and lasting peace*” can barely conceal a plan to enslave humanity. There are no statistics on this matter, but the examples we have been seen so far lead us to conclude that the Jewish community is, by far, the most suicidal community in the world.

The famous “Austrian” novelist Stefan Zweig killed himself in Brazil in 1942 – and the Nazis had nothing to do with it (see *Jewish Fanaticism*, 2007). The philosopher Walter Benjamin committed suicide in 1940 after crossing the Spanish border. The German dramatist Kurt Tucholsky killed himself in 1934 by swallowing sleeping pills, just like his fellow Jew Ludwig Fulda, who killed himself in 1939, etc.

At this point, Jewish intellectuals always blame the usual scapegoat: the “Nazis”. “*If the Jews commit suicide, it’s the fault of the Nazis, and nobody else*”. But in reality, Jews didn’t have to wait for the Nazis to come along before they started killing themselves. They were busy killing themselves long before the war: the “Italian” philosopher Felice Momigliano committed suicide in 1924.

The Viennese physician and philosopher Ludwig Boltzmann hanged himself in 1906. The Austrian philosopher Otto Weininger shot himself in mid- October 1903. In 1928, the only daughter of the “Austrian” Arthur Schnitzler committed suicide with a revolver in Venice, at the age of 19. The eldest son of the Austrian poet Hugo von Hofmannsthal committed suicide at the age of 26 – once again, with a revolver. Not to mention two of Karl Marx’s daughters. The daughter of the grand rabbi Weil threw herself off the Eiffel Tower, etc.

At the beginning of the 20th century, Kafka spoke of the pathological oddness and mental imbalance of his fellow Jewish students at the German high school in Prague. “*Many of them*”, he wrote, “*killed themselves during their student years*”. Or just look at Yosseph Hayim Brenner, a Jewish novelist born in the Ukraine in 1881. His two heroes in *Around the Point* succumb to despair, one by suicide, the other by going insane.

The novelist Romain Gary committed suicide in 1980; so did the “philosopher” Albert Caraco, in 1971.

The well-known “Italian” writer Primo Levi committed suicide in 1987, after a lifetime of “*bearing witness*” to his experiences in the “*death camps*”; but he had already attempted suicide as an adolescent.

Jerzy Kosinski, another fantasizing “*witness*”, ended up a suicide in 1991, with barbiturates.

The “*historian*” of the “*death camps*”, Joseph Wulf, killed himself in 1974.

In 1970, the painter Rothko put an end to his career in abstract art by cutting his veins. In the same year, the German Jewish poet Paul Celan threw himself in the Seine. The mother of the Israeli writer Amos Oz committed suicide in 1952, at the age of 39. And the writer Elie Wiesel is surrounded by a veritable massacre of suicides on all side.

Boris Fraenkel, one of the founders of the International Communist Organization (OCI) committed suicide in 2006 by throwing himself in the Seine. Michel Recanati, a Trotskyite leader in May 1968, committed suicide in 1978. The 18 November 2008 edition of the Communist newspaper *Liberation* contained the testimony of a former Maoist – also a Jew – who declared that suicide was a very common cause of death among radical militants in his group in the 70s: 15 out of 35.

Bruno Bettelheim, the child psychiatrist of worldwide fame, committed suicide as well. Bettelheim specialised in infantile autism in particular, claiming to have treated hundreds of schizophrenics. The international media made a star out of him, admired by millions. In reality, as revealed by the biographical investigations of Paul Roazen in 1992, Bettelheim was a mythomaniac and a faker – like Primo Levi, like Marek Halter, like Elie Wiesel, like Simon Wiesenthal, like Einstein, Freud, and so many others. Bettelheim committed suicide in March 1990, asphyxiating himself with a plastic bag (*The Mirror of Judaism*, 2009).

Looking more closely, then, we see that the total, absolute and lasting “*universal peace*”, as dreamt of by the prophets of Israel, more than anything else, is a “*peace*” which Jews cannot find within themselves. It is their neurosis which impels them to invest themselves with plans for “*world unification*”.

At the beginning of this, the third millennium, this hysterical contagion is propagating itself in all homes, threatening all cultures, all religions, all identities. Nothing seems capable of stopping the advance of this unifying, anti-racist, materialistic and – in the end – destructive frenzy, which represents a deadly threat to all of humanity.

Reading the Jews with a mirror, the following words become finally visible as well: “*Judaism is a Crime against Humanity*”. Using a mirror, once again, then permits us, for the first time, to interpret Jewish eschatology in its correct sense: in the realization that the coming of the Messiah will occur only after the apostasy – the

disappearance of the last Jew.

Such is the tragedy of every Jew on earth. Invested with the mission to “*save humanity*”, he can only choose to destroy humanity or destroy himself. The tragedy of the Jewish condition is revealed here in its full light... in the reflection of a mirror.

Paris, April 2012





# **THE NAMELESS WAR**

**BY CAPTAIN ACHIBALD.H.MAULE RAMSAY**

**Britons Publishing Company**

London

1952

Reprinted 1956, 1977. Other reprints in Australia and elsewhere.  
Sometimes with abridgements

Internet

**AAARGH**

2009

COMPLETE TEXT SIMILAR TO THE PRINTED EDITION.

THE AUTHOR:

[Captain Archibald Maule Ramsay](#) was educated at Eton and the Royal Military College, Sandhurst, and served with the 2nd Battalion Coldstream Guards in the First World War until he was severely wounded in 1916 - thereafter at Regimental H.Q. and the War Office and the British War Mission in Paris until the end of the war.

From 1920 he became a Member of H.M. Scottish Bodyguard.

In 1931 he was elected a Member of Parliament for Midlothian and Peeblesshire.

Arrested under Regulation 18b on the 23rd May, 1940, he was detained, without charge or trial, in a cell in Brixton Prison until the 26th September, 1944. On the following morning he resumed his seat in the House of Commons and remained there until the end of that Parliament in 1945.

## THE NAMELESS WAR

Here is the story that people have said would never be written in our time - the true history of events leading up to the Second World War, told by one who enjoyed the friendship and confidence of Mr. Neville Chamberlain during the critical months between Munich and September, 1939.

There has long been **an unofficial ban** on books dealing with what Captain Ramsay calls *The Nameless War*, the conflict which has been waged from behind the political scene for centuries, which is still being waged and of which very few are aware. The publishers of *The Nameless War* believe this latest exposure will do more than any previous attempt to break the conspiracy of silence. The present work, with much additional evidence and a fuller historical background, is the outcome of the personal experiences of a public figure who in the course of duty has discovered at first-hand the existence of a centuries old conspiracy against Britain, Europe, and the whole of Christendom.

*The Nameless War* reveals an unsuspected link between all the major revolutions in Europe - from King Charles I's time to the abortive attempt against Spain in 1936. One source of inspiration, design and supply is shown to be common to all of them. These revolutions and the World War of 1939 are seen to be integral parts of one and the same master plan.

After a brief review of the forces behind the declaration of war and the world wide arrests of many who endeavoured to oppose them, the author describes the anatomy of the Revolutionary International machine — the machine which today continues the plan for supranational world power, the age-old Messianic dream of International Jewry.

It is the author's belief that the machine would break down without the support of its unwilling Jews and unsuspecting Gentiles and he puts forward suggestions for detaching these elements.

### *Christians say ...*

"Captain Ramsay, a Christian gentleman of unflagging courage, believed that the war with Germany was not conceived in the interests of Britain and could lead only to the extension of Communist and Jewish power. Because he warned his fellow countrymen of the forces at work, he was put in prison without trial for 4+ years, for 'reasons' so preposterous that those who framed

them dared not submit them to a court of law."

*Truth*

"For years Captain Ramsay had been a member of the British Parliament. His book is an analysis of the Jewish-Zionist war against Christian civilization."

*The Cross and the Flag*

***Jews say ...***

"There is no limit to the depths of human depravity, Captain Maule Ramsay ... seems to have made a very determined attempt to plumb those depths."

*The Jewish Chronicle*

"The publication of such a book, at this time, underlines the urgent need for the law to be reformed so as to make it a crime to preach racial hatred or publish libels on groups in the community."

*The Daily Worker*

## CONTENTS

### PROLOGUE

1. THE BRITISH REVOLUTION
2. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION
3. THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION
4. DEVELOPMENT OF REVOLUTIONARY  
TECHNIQUE
5. GERMANY BELLS THE CAT
6. 1933: JEWRY DECLARES WAR
7. "PHONEY WAR" ENDED BY CIVILIAN  
BOMBING
8. DUNKIRK AND AFTER
9. THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME
10. PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S ROLE
11. REGULATION 18B
12. WHO DARES?

### EPILOGUE

#### APPENDIX 1

#### APPENDIX 2

#### APPENDIX 3

#### APPENDIX 4

#### APPENDIX 5

To the memory of those Patriots who in 1215 at Runnymede signed Magna Carta and those who in 1320 at Arbroath signed the Declaration of Independence this book is dedicated. 27th July 1952.

[9]

## PROLOGUE

Edward I banished the Jews from England for many grave offences endangering the welfare of his realm and lieges, which were to a great extent indicated in the Statutes of Jewry (<sup>1</sup>), enacted by his Parliament in 1290, the Commons playing a prominent part.

The King of France very shortly followed suit, as did other Rulers in Christian Europe. So grave did the situation for the Jews in Europe become, that an urgent appeal for help and advice was addressed by them to the Sanhedrin, then located at Constantinople.

This appeal was sent over the signature of Chemor, Rabbi of Arles in Provence, on the 13th January, 1489. The reply came in November, 1489, which was issued over the signature of V.S.S. V.F.F. Prince of the Jews. It advised the Jews of Europe to adopt the tactics of the Trojan Horse ; to make their sons Christian priests, lawyers, doctors, etc., and work to destroy the Christian structure from within.

The first notable repercussion to this advice occurred in Spain in the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella. Many Jews were by then enrolled as Christians, but remaining secretly Jews were working to destroy the Christian church in Spain.

So grave became the menace finally, that the Inquisition was instituted in an endeavour to cleanse the country from these conspirators. Once again the Jews were compelled to commence an exodus from yet another country, whose hospitality they had abused.

Trekking eastwards, these Jews joined other Jewish [10] communities in western Europe ; considerable numbers flowed on to Holland and Switzerland.

From now on these two countries were to become active centres of Jewish intrigue. Jewry, however, has always needed a powerful seafaring nation to which to attach itself.

Great Britain, newly united under James I, was a rising naval power, which

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix 2, which will appear in the final Part of this series.

was already beginning to sway the four corners of the discovered world. Here also there existed a wonderful field for disruptive criticism ; for although it was a Christian kingdom, yet it was one most sharply divided as between Protestant and Catholic.

A campaign for exploiting this division and fanning hatreds between the Christian communities was soon in process of organization. How well the Jews succeeded in this campaign in Britain may be judged from the fact that one of the earliest acts of 'their creature and hireling' Oliver Cromwell, after executing the King according to plan, was to allow the Jews free access to England once more.



# 1

## THE BRITISH REVOLUTION

"It was fated that England should be the first of a series of Revolutions, which is not yet finished."

With these cryptic words Isaac Disraeli, father of Benjamin Earl of Beaconsfield, commenced his two volume life of Charles I published in 1851. A work of astonishing detail and insight, much information for which, he states, was obtained from the records of one Melchior de Salom, French envoy in England during that period.

The scene opens with distant glimpses of the British Kingdom based upon Christianity, and its own ancient traditions ; these sanctions binding Monarchy, Church, State, nobles and the people in one solemn bond on the one hand ; on the other hand, the ominous rumblings of Calvinism.

Calvin, who came to Geneva from France, where his name was spelt Cauin, <sup>(2)</sup> possibly a French effort to spell Cohen, organized great numbers of revolutionary orators, not a few of whom were inflicted upon England and Scotland. Thus was laid the groundwork for revolution under a cloak of religious fervour.

On both sides of the Tweed these demagogues contracted all religion into rigid observance of the "Sabbath." To use the words of Isaac Disraeli, "the nation was artfully divided into Sabbatarians and Sabbath breakers." "Calvin," states Disraeli, "deemed the Sabbath to have been a Jewish ordinance, limited to the sacred people." He goes on to say that when these Calvinists held the country in their power, "it seemed that religion chiefly consisted of Sabbatarian rigours ; and that a British senate had been transformed [12] into a company of Hebrew Rabbins": and later "In 1650, after the execution of the King, an Act was passed inflicting penalties for a breach of the Sabbath."

Buckingham, Strafford and Laud are the three chief figures round the King in these early stages: Men on whose loyalty to himself, the nation, and the

---

<sup>2</sup> At a B'nai B'rith meeting in Paris reported in *Catholic Gazette* in Feb. 1936 he was claimed to be of Jewish extraction.

ancient tradition Charles can rely.

Buckingham, the trusted friend of King James I, and of those who had saved his life at the time of the Gowrie Conspiracy (of ominous cabalistic associations) was assassinated in the early years of King Charles' reign under mysterious circumstances.

Strafford, who had been in his early days inclined to follow the opposite faction, later left them ; and became a staunch and devoted adherent of the King.

This opposition faction became steadily more hostile to Charles and by the time that they were led by Pym and decided to impeach Strafford. "The King," writes Disraeli, "regarded this faction as his enemies" ; and he states that the head of this faction was the Earl of Bedford. Walsh, the eminent Catholic historian, states that a Jew wine merchant named Roussel was the founder of this family in Tudor times.

With the impeachment and execution of Strafford, the powers behind the rising Calvinist, or Cohenist, Conspiracy began to reveal themselves, and their focus, the City of London.

At this time there suddenly began to appear from the City armed mobs of "Operatives" (the medieval equivalent for "workers" no doubt). Let me quote Disraeli: "They were said to amount to ten thousand ... with war-like weapons. It was a militia for insurgency at all seasons, and might be depended upon for any work of destruction at the cheapest rate ... as these sallied forth with daggers and bludgeons (from the city) the inference is obvious that this [13] train of explosion must have been long laid."

It must indeed ; and we must recollect here, that at this time Strafford was still unexecuted, and civil war in the minds of none but of those behind the scenes, who evidently had long since resolved upon and planned it.

These armed mobs of "workers" intimidated all and sundry, including both Houses of Parliament and the Palace at critical moments, exactly on the model employed later by the "Sacred Bands" and the "Marseillais" in the French Revolution.

Isaac Disraeli draws again and again startling parallels between this and the French Revolution : Notably in his passages on the Press, "no longer under restraint," and the deluge of revolutionary pamphlets and leaflets. "From 1640 to 1660," he writes, "about 30,000 appear to have started up." And later, "the collection of French revolutionary pamphlets now stands by the side of the

French tracts of the age of Charles I, as abundant in number and as fierce in passion."

He goes on, "Whose hand behind the curtain played the strings ... could post up a correct list of 59 commoners, branding them with the odious title of 'Straffordians or betrayers of their country'."

Whose hand indeed? But Disraeli who knew so much, now discreetly draws a veil over that iron curtain ; and it is left to us to complete the revelation.

To do so we must turn to such other works as the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Sombart's work, *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, and others. From these we learn that Cromwell, the chief figure of the revolution, was in close contact with the powerful Jew financiers in Holland ; and was in fact paid large sums of money by Manasseh Ben Israel ; whilst Fernandez Carvajal, "The Great Jew" as he was called, was the chief contractor of the New Model Army.

In *The Jews in England* we read :

"1643 brought a large [14] contingent of Jews to England, their rallying point was the house of the Portuguese Ambassador De Souza, a Marano (secret Jew). Prominent among them was Fernandez Carvajal, a great financier and army contractor."

In January of the previous year, the attempted arrest of the five members had set in violent motion the armed gangs of "Operatives" already mentioned, from the city. Revolutionary pamphlets were broadcasted on this occasion, as Disraeli tells us : "Bearing the ominous insurrectionary cry of 'To your tents, O Israel'." Shortly after this the King and the Royal Family left the Palace of Whitehall. The five members with armed mobs and banners accompanying them, were given a triumphal return to Westminster. The stage was now set for the advent of Carvajal and his Jews and the rise of their creature Cromwell.

The scene now changes. The Civil War has taken its course. The year is 1647: Naseby has been won and lost. The King is virtually a prisoner, while treated as an honoured guest at Holmby House.

According to a letter published in *Plain English* <sup>(3)</sup> on 3rd September, 1921 :

"The Learned Elders have been in existence for a much longer period

---

<sup>3</sup> A weekly review published by the North British Publishing Co. and edited by the late Lord Alfred Douglas.

than they have perhaps suspected. My friend, Mr. L. D. van Valckert, of Amsterdam, has recently sent me a letter containing two extracts from the Synagogue at Mulheim. The volume in which they are contained was lost at some period during the Napoleonic Wars, and has recently come into Mr. van Valckert's possession. It is written in German, and contains extracts of letters sent and received by the authorities of the Mulheim Synagogue. The first entry he sends me is of a letter received :

16th June, 1647.

From O.C. (i.e. Oliver Cromwell), by Ebenezer Pratt.

In return for financial support will advocate admission of Jews to England: This however impossible while Charles living. [15]

Charles cannot be executed without trial, adequate grounds for which do not at present exist. Therefore advise that Charles be assassinated, but will have nothing to do with arrangements for procuring an assassin, though willing to help in his escape.

In reply was dispatched the following :

12th July, 1647.

To O.C. by E. Pratt.

Will grant financial aid as soon as Charles removed and Jews admitted. Assassination too dangerous. Charles shall be given opportunity to escape : His recapture will make trial and execution possible. The support will be liberal, but useless to discuss terms until trial commences."

With this information now at our disposal, the subsequent moves on the part of the regicides stand out with a new clearness. On 4th June, 1647, Cornet Joyce, acting on secret orders from Cromwell himself, and, according to Disraeli, unknown even to General-in-Chief Fairfax, descended upon Holmby House with 500 picked revolutionary troopers, and seized the King. According to Disraeli,

"The plan was arranged on May 30th at a secret meeting held at Cromwell's house, though later Cromwell pretending that it was without his concurrence."

This move coincided with a sudden development in the army ; the rise of the "Levelers" and "Rationalists". Their doctrines were those of the French revolutionaries ; in fact, what we know today as Communism. These were the regicides, who four times "purged" Parliament, till there was left finally 50 members, Communist-like themselves, known later as the Rump.

To return to the letter from Mulheim Synagogue of the 12th June, 1647, and its cunning suggestion that attempted escape should be used as a pretext for execution. Just such an event took place, on 12th November of that year. Hollis

and Ludlow consider the flight as a stratagem of Cromwell's. Isaac Disraeli states:

"Contemporary historians have decided that the King from the day of his deportation from [16] Holmby to his escape to the Isle of Wight was throughout the dupe of Cromwell."

Little more remains to be said. Cromwell had carried out the orders from the Synagogue, and now it only remained to stage the mock trial.

Maneuvering for position continued for some time. And it became apparent that the House of Commons, even in their partially "purged" condition, were in favour of coming to an agreement with the King. On 5th December, 1648, the House sat all night ; and finally carried the question, "That the King's concessions were satisfactory to a settlement."

Should such agreement have been reached, of course, Cromwell would not have received the large sums of money which he was hoping to get from the Jews. He struck again. On the night of December 6th, Colonel Pryde, on his instructions, carried out the last and most famous "purge" of the House of Commons, known as "Pryde's Purge." On 4th January, the Communist remnant of 50 members, the Rump, invested themselves with "the supreme authority."

On 9th January "a High Court of Justice" to try the King was proclaimed. Two-thirds of its members were Levelers from the Army.

Algernon Sidney warned Cromwell : "First, the King can be tried by no court. Second, no man can be tried by this court." So writes Hugh Ross Williamson in his *Charles and Cromwell* ; and he adds a finishing touch to the effect that "no English lawyer could be found to draw up the charge, which was eventually entrusted to an accommodating alien, Isaac Dorislaus."

Needless to say, Isaac Dorislaus was exactly the same sort of alien as Carvajal and Manasseh Ben Israel and the other financiers who paid the "Protector" his blood money.

The Jews were once again permitted to land freely in England in spite of strong protests by the sub-committee of the Council of State, which declared that they would be a [17] grave menace to the State and the Christian religion. Perhaps it is due to their protests that the actual act of banishment has never to this day been repealed.

"The English Revolution under Charles I," writes Isaac Disraeli, "was

unlike any preceding one ... From that time and event we contemplate in our history the phases of revolution." There were many more to follow on similar lines, notably in France. In 1897 a further important clue to these mysterious happenings fell into Gentile hands in the shape of *the Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. In that document we read this remarkable sentence: "Remember the French Revolution, the secrets of its preparation are well known to us for it was entirely the work of our hands." [*Protocol No.3, 14.*]

The Elders might have made the passage even fuller, and written, "Remember the British and French revolutions, the secrets of which are well known to us for they were entirely the work of our hands."

The difficult problem of the subjugation of both Kingdoms was still however unsolved. Scotland was Royalist before everything else ; and she had proclaimed Charles II King. Cromwell's armies marched round Scotland, aided by their Geneva sympathizers, dispensing Judaic barbarity ; but Scotland still called Charles II King. He moreover accepted the Presbyterian form of Christianity for Scotland ; and slowly but steadily the feeling in England began to come round to the Scottish point of view. Finally upon the death of Cromwell, all Britain welcomed the King's restoration to the throne of England.

In 1660 Charles II returned ; but there was an important difference between the Kingdom he had fled from as a boy, and the one to which he returned as King. The enemies of Kingship were entrenched within his kingdom now, and as soon as the stage should be set for renewing the propaganda against the papacy and so, dividing once more persons, all of whom considered themselves as part of Christ's Church, [18] the next attack would develop. The next attack would aim at placing the control of the finances of both Kingdoms in the hands of the Jews, who were now firmly ensconced within.

Charles evidently had no consciousness of the Jewish problem or plans, or the menace they held for his peoples. The wisdom and experience of Edward I had become lost in the centuries of segregation from the Jewish virus. A consciousness of the danger to the Crown in placing his enemies in possession of the weapon of a "Popish Plot" cry he did retain.

With James II's accession, the crisis could not be long delayed. The most unscrupulous pamphleteering and propaganda was soon in full swing against him, and it is no surprise to find that many of the vilest pamphlets were actually printed in Holland. This country was now quite openly the focus for all disaffected persons ; and considerable comings and goings took place during these years.



Stories were brought to the King that his own brother-in-law had joined those who plotted against him ; but he utterly refused to credit them, or take any action till news came that the expedition against himself was actually under way.

The chief figure amongst those who deserted James at that crucial juncture was John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough. It is interesting to read in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* that this Duke for many years received not less than 6,000 pounds a year from the Dutch Jew Solomon Medina.

The real objective of the "Glorious Revolution" was achieved a few years later in 1694, when the Royal consent was given for the setting up of the "Bank of England" and the institution of the National Debt. This charter handed over to an anonymous committee the Royal prerogative of minting money ; converted the basis of wealth to gold ; and enabled the international money lenders to secure their loans [19] on the taxes of the country, instead of the doubtful undertaking of some ruler or potentate which was all the security they could previously obtain.

From that time economic machinery was set in motion which ultimately reduced all wealth to the fictitious terms of gold which the Jews control ; and drained away the life blood of the land, the real wealth which was the birthright of the British peoples.

The political and economic union of England and Scotland was shortly afterwards forced upon Scotland with wholesale corruption, and in defiance of formal protests from every county and borough. The main objects of the Union were to suppress the Royal Mint in Scotland, and to force upon her, too, responsibility for the "National Debt." The grip of the moneylender was now complete throughout Britain. The danger was that the members of the new joint Parliament would sooner or later, in the spirit of their ancestors, challenge this state of affairs.

To provide against this, therefore, the party system was now brought into being, frustrating true national reaction and enabling the wire-pullers to divide and rule ; using their newly-established financial power to ensure that their own men and their own policies should secure the limelight, and sufficient support from their newspapers, pamphlets, and banking accounts to carry the day.

Gold was soon to become the basis of loans, ten times the size of the amount deposited. In other words, 100 pounds in gold would be legal security for 1,000 pounds of loan ; at 3% therefore 100 pounds in gold could earn 30 pounds interest annually with no more trouble to the lender than the keeping of a

few ledger entries.

The owner of 100 pounds of land, however, still must work every hour of daylight in order to make perhaps 4%. The end of the process must only be a matter of time. The moneylenders must become millionaires ; those who own [20] and work the land, the Englishman and the Scotsman, must be ruined.

The process has continued inexorably till now, when it is nearly completed. It has been hypocritically camouflaged by clever propaganda as helping the poor by mulcting the rich. It has been in reality nothing of the kind. It has been in the main the deliberate ruination of the landed classes, the leaders among the Gentiles, and their supplanting by the Jew financiers and their hangers-on.



[21]

## 2

### THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

The French Revolution of 1789 was the most startling event in the history of Europe since the fall of Rome.

A new phenomenon then appeared before the world.

Never before had a mob apparently organized successful revolution against all other classes in the state, under high sounding, but quite nonsensical slogans, and with methods bearing not a trace of the principles enshrined in those slogans. Never before had any one section of any nation conquered all other sections ; and still less swept away every feature of the national life and tradition, from King, religion, nobles, clergy, constitution, flag, calendar, and place names, to coinage.

Such a phenomenon merits the closest attention ; especially in view of the fact that it has been followed by identical outbreaks in many countries.

The main discovery that such an examination will reveal is this fact: the revolution was not the work of Frenchmen to improve France. It was the work of aliens, whose object was to destroy everything, which had been France.

This conclusion is borne out by the references to "foreigners" in high places in the Revolutionary Councils, not only by Sir Walter Scott, but by Robespierre himself.

We have the names of several of them, and it is clear that they were not British, or Germans, or Italians, or any other nationals ; they were, of course, Jews.

Let us see what the Jews themselves have to say about it : [22]

"Remember the French Revolution to which it was we who gave the name of 'Great.' The secrets of its preparation are well known to us for it was wholly the work of our hands."

*Protocols of Zion* — No. 7.

"We were the first to cry among the masses of the people the words 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.' The stupid Gentile poll parrots flew down from all sides on to these baits, and with them carried away the well-being of the world. The would-be-wise men of the Gentiles were so stupid that they could not see that in nature there is no equality, and there cannot be freedom (meaning, of course, freedom as understood by Socialists and Communists, freedom to wreck your own country)."

*Protocols of Zion* — No. 1.

With this knowledge in our possession we shall find we possess a master key to the intricate happenings of the French Revolution. The somewhat confused picture of characters and events moving across the screen, which our history books have shown us, will suddenly become a concerted and connected human drama.

When we begin to draw parallels between France of 1789, Britain of 1640, Russia of 1917, Germany and Hungary of 1918-19, and Spain of 1936, we shall feel that drama grip us with a new and personal sense of reality.

"Revolution is a blow struck at a paralytic." Even so, however, it must be obvious that immense organization, and vast resources, as well as cunning and secrecy far above the ordinary are necessary for its successful preparation.

It is amazing indeed that people should suppose that "mobs" or "the people" ever have, or ever could, undertake such a complicated and costly operation. No mistake more-over could be more dangerous ; for it will result in total inability to recognize the true significance of events, or the source and focus of a revolutionary movement. The process of organizing revolution is seen to be firstly the infliction of paralysis ; and secondly, the striking of the blow or blows. It is for the first process, the production of paralysis, that [23] the secrecy is essential. Its outward signs are debt, loss of publicity control, and the existence of alien-influenced secret organizations in the doomed state.

Debt, particularly international debt, is the first and over-mastering grip. Through it men in high places are suborned, and alien powers and influences are introduced into the body politic. When the debt grip has been firmly established, control of every form of publicity and political activity soon follows, together with a full grip on industrialists. The stage for the revolutionary blow is then set. The grip of the right hand of finance established the paralysis ; while it is the

revolutionary left that holds the dagger and deals the fatal blow. Moral corruption facilitates the whole process.

By 1780 financial paralysis was making its appearance in France. The world's big financiers were firmly established. "They possessed so large a share of the world's gold and silver stocks, that they had most of Europe in their debt, certainly France." So writes Mr McNair Wilson in his *Life of Napoleon*, and continues on page 38 :

"A change of a fundamental kind had taken place in the economic structure of Europe whereby the old basis had ceased to be wealth and had become debt. In the old Europe wealth had been measured in lands, crops, herds and minerals ; but a new standard had now been introduced, namely, a form of money to which the title 'credit' had been given."

The debts of the French Kingdom though substantial were by no means insurmountable, except in terms of gold: and had the King's advisers decided to issue money on the security of the lands and real wealth of France, the position could have been fairly easily righted. As it was the situation was firmly gripped by one financier after another, who either could not or would not break with the system imposed by the international usurers.

Under such weakness, or villainy, the bonds of usury [24] could only grow heavier and more terrible, for debts were in terms of gold or silver, neither of which France produced.

And who were the potentates of the new debt machine ; these manipulators of gold and silver, who had succeeded in turning upside down the finances of Europe, and replacing real wealth by millions upon millions of usurious loans?

The late Lady Queenborough, in her important work *Occult Theocracy* gives us certain outstanding names, taking her facts from *L'Anti-Sémitisme* by the Jew Bernard Lazare, 1894. In London she gives the names of Benjamin Goldsmid and his brother Abraham Goldsmid, Moses Mocatta their partner, and his nephew Sir Moses Montifiore, as being directly concerned in financing the French Revolution, along with Daniel Itsig of Berlin and his son-in-law David Friedlander, and Herz Cerfbeer of Alsace.

These names recall the *Protocols of Zion*, and turning up Number 20 we read :

"The gold standard has been the ruin of States which adopted it, for it has not been able to satisfy the demands for money, the more so as we have removed

gold from circulation as far as possible."

And Again :

"Loans hang like a Sword of Damocles over the heads of rulers who ... come begging with outstretched palm."

No words could describe more aptly what was overtaking France. Sir Walter Scott in his *Life of Napoleon*, Vol. 1, thus describes the situation :

"These financiers used the government as bankrupt prodigals are treated by usurious moneylenders, who feeding their extravagance with the one hand, with the other wring out of their ruined fortunes the most unreasonable recompenses for their advances. By a long succession of these ruinous loans, and the various rights granted to guarantee them, the whole finances of France were brought to total confusion."

King Louis' chief finance minister during these last years of growing confusion was Necker, "a Swiss" of German [25] extraction, son of a German professor of whom McNair Wilson writes :

"Necker had forced his way into the King's Treasury as a representative of the debt system owning allegiance to that system."

We can easily imagine what policy that allegiance inspired in Necker ; and when we add to this the fact that his previous record was that of a daring and unscrupulous speculator, we can understand why the national finances of France under his baneful aegis rapidly worsened, so that after four years of his manipulations, the unfortunate King's government had contracted an additional and far more serious debt of 170,000,000 pounds.

By 1730 Freemasonry had been introduced into France from England. By 1771 the movement had attained such proportions that Phillipe Duc de Chartres afterwards d'Orleans became Grand Master. This type of freemasonry was largely innocent, both in policy and personnel in its early days ; but as events proved, the real moving spirits were ruthless and unscrupulous men of blood.

The Duc d'Orleans was not one of these latter. Though a man of little principle, and an extravagant, vain and ambitious libertine, he had no motives beyond the ousting of the King, and the establishing of a democratic monarchy with himself as that monarch. Having in addition but little intelligence, he made the ideal stalking horse for the first and most moderate stage of revolution, and a willing tool of men whom he probably scarcely knew ; and who sent him to the guillotine soon after his base and away role had been played.

The Marquis de Mirabeau who succeeded him as the leading figure of the Revolution was cast in much the same role. He was a much abler man than d'Orleans, but so foul a libertine that he was shunned by all his own class, and imprisoned more than once at the instance of his own father.

[26] He is known to have been financed by Moses Mendelssohn, head of the Jewish Illuminati, and to have been more in the company of the Jewess Mrs. Herz than was her husband. He was not only an early figure-head in French Freemasonry in the respectable years, but introduced Illuminism into France.

This Illuminism was a secret revolutionary society behind freemasonry. The Illuminati penetrated into all the lodges of Grand Orient Freemasonry, and were backed and organized by cabalistic Jews. It is interesting to note that the Duc d'Orleans and Talleyrand were both initiated into Illuminism by Mirabeau shortly after the latter had introduced it into France, from Frankfurt, where its headquarters had been established in 1782 under Adam Weishaupt.

In 1785 there happened a strange event, which makes it seem as though the heavenly powers themselves made a last moment attempt to warn France and Europe against these massing powers of evil. Lightning struck dead a messenger of the Illuminati at Ratisbon. The police found on the body papers dealing with plans for world revolution. Thereupon the Bavarian Government had the headquarters of the Illuminati searched, and much further evidence was discovered. French authorities were informed, but the process of paralysis was too far advanced, and no action resulted.

By 1789 there were more than two thousand Lodges in France affiliated to the Grand Orient, the direct tool of international revolution ; and their adepts numbered over 100,000.

Thus we get Jewish Illuminism under Moses Mendelssohn and Masonic Illuminism under Weishaupt established as the inner controls of a strong secret organization covering the whole of France. Under the Illuminati worked Grand Orient Freemasonry, and under that again the Blue, or National, Masonry had operated until it was converted over-night into Grand Orient Masonry by Phillipe d'Orleans in 1773. Little [27] did Egalité suspect the satanic powers that he was invoking, when he took that action, and satanic they certainly were. The name Lucifer means "Light Bearer" ; and Illuminati those who were lit by that light.

By the time the Estates General met at Versailles on 5th May, 1789, the paralysis of the executive authority by the secret organizations was complete.

Paralysis by control of public opinion and publicity was well advanced by then also.

This was the manner of its accomplishment.

By 1780 d'Orleans' entire income of 800,000 livres, thanks to his reckless gambling and extravagance, was mortgaged to the moneylenders. In 1781, in return for accommodation, he signed papers handing over his palace, estates, and house the Palais Royal, to his creditors, with powers to form there a centre of politics, printing, pamphleteering, gambling, lectures, brothels, wine-shops, theatres, art galleries, athletics, and any other uses, which subsequently took the form of every variety of public debauchery. In fact, Egalité's financial masters used his name and property to install a colossal organism for publicity and corruption, which appealed to every lowest instinct in human nature ; and deluged the enormous crowds so gathered with the filthy, defamatory and revolutionary output of its printing presses and debating clubs. As Scudder writes in *A Prince of the Blood* :

"It gave the police more to do than all the other parts of the city." It is interesting to note that the general manager installed by the creditors at the Palais royal was one de Laclos, a political adventurer of alien origin, author of *Liaisons Dangereuses*, and other pornographic works, who was said "to study the politics of love because of his love for politics."

This steady stream of corruption and destructive propaganda was linked with a series of systematic personal attacks of the vilest and most unscrupulous nature upon any public characters whom the Jacobins thought likely to stand in their [28] way. This process was known as "L'infamie."

Marie Antoinette herself was one of the chief targets for this typically Jewish form of attack. No lie or abuse was too vile to level at her. More intelligent, alert, and vigorous than the weak and indolent Louis, Marie Antoinette presented a considerable obstacle to the revolution. She had, moreover, received many warnings regarding freemasonry from her sister in Austria ; and no doubt was by this time more awake to its significance than when she had written to her sister some years previously :

"I believe that as far as France is concerned, you worry too much about freemasonry. Here it is far from having the significance that it may have elsewhere in Europe. Here everything is open and one knows all. Then where could the danger be? One might well be worried if it were a question of a political secret society. But on the contrary the government lets it spread, and it is only that which it seems, an association the objects of which are union and



charity. One dines, one sings, one talks, which has given the King occasion to say that people who drink and sing are not suspect of organizing plots. Nor is it a society of atheists, for we are told God is on the lips of all. They are very charitable. They bring up the children of their poor and dead members. They endow their daughters. What harm is there in all that?"

What harm indeed if these blameless pretensions masked no darker designs? Doubtless the agents of Weishaupt and Mendelssohn reported on to them the contents of the Queen's letter ; and we can imagine them shaking with laughter, and rubbing their hands in satisfaction ; hands that were itching to destroy the very life of France and her Queen ; and which at the appropriate hour would give the signal that would convert secret conspiracy into the "massacres of September" and the blood baths of the guillotine.

In order to further the campaign of calumny against the Queen, an elaborate hoax was arranged at the time, when [29] the financiers and grain speculators were deliberately creating conditions of poverty and hunger in Paris.

A diamond necklace valued at nearly a quarter of a million was ordered at the Court jewellers in the Queen's name by an agent of the Jacobins. The unfortunate Queen knew nothing of this affair until the necklace was brought round to her for acceptance, when she naturally disclaimed anything to do with the matter, pointing out that she would consider it wrong to order such a thing when France was in so bad a financial way. The printing presses of the Palais Royal, however, turned full blast on to the subject ; and every kind of criticism leveled at the Queen. A further scandal was then engineered for the presses. Some prostitute from the Palais Royal was engaged to disguise herself as the Queen ; and by the forged letter the Cardinal Prince de Rohan was induced to meet the supposed Queen about midnight at the Palais Royal, supposing he was being asked for advice and help by the Queen on the subject of the necklace. This event, needless to say, was immediately reported to the printing presses and pamphleteers, who started a further campaign containing the foulest innuendoes that could be imagined concerning the whole affair. The moving spirit behind the scene was Cagliostro, alias Joseph Balsamo, a Jew from Palermo, a doctor of the cabalistic art, and a member of the Illuminati, into which he was initiated at Frankfurt by Weishaupt in 1774. When the necklace had finally served its purpose, it was sent over to London, where most of the stones were retained by the Jew Eliason.

Attacks of a similar nature were directed against many other decent people, who resisted the influence of the Jacobin clubs. After eight years of this work the process of paralysis by mastery of publicity was complete.

In every respect therefore by 1789, when the financiers forced the King to summon the Estates General, the first portion of their plans for revolution (i.e. paralysis) were [30] accomplished.

It now only remained to strike the blow or series of blows, which were to rob France of her throne, her church, her constitution, her nobles, her clergy, her gentry, her bourgeoisie, her traditions, and her culture ; leaving in their place, when the guillotine's work was done, citizen hewers of wood and drawers of water under an alien financial dictatorship.

From 1789 onwards a succession of revolutionary acts were set in motion ; each more violent than the one preceding it ; each unmasking fresh demands and more violent and revolutionary leaders. In their turn each of these leaders, a puppet only of the real powers behind the revolution, is set aside ; and his head rolls into the basket to join those of his victims of yesterday.

Philippe Egalité, Duc d'Orleans, was used to prepare the ground for the revolution ; to protect with his name and influence the infancy of the revolutionary club ; to popularize freemasonry and the Palais Royal ; and to sponsor such acts as the march of the women to Versailles. The "women" on this occasion were mostly men in disguise.

d'Orleans was under the impression that the King and Queen would be assassinated by this mob, and himself proclaimed a democratic King. The real planners of the march, however, had other schemes in view. One main objective was to secure the removal of the royal family to Paris, where they would be clear of protection from the army, and under the power of the Commune or Paris County Council in which the Jacobins were supreme.

They continued to make use of Egalite right up to the time of the vote on the King's life, when he crowned his sordid career by leading the open vote in voting for the death of his cousin. His masters thereafter had no further use for his services ; and he very shortly followed his cousin to the guillotine amidst the execrations of all classes.

[31] Mirabeau played a similar role to that of Egalite. He had intended that the revolution should cease with the setting up of Louis as a democratic monarch with himself as chief adviser. He had no desire to see violence done to the King. On the contrary, in the last days before he died mysteriously by poison, he exerted all his efforts to get the King removed from Paris, and placed in charge of loyal generals still commanding his army. He was the last of the moderates and monarchists to dominate the Jacobin club of Paris ; that bloodthirsty focus of revolution, which had materialized out of the secret clubs



of the Orient Masons and Illuminati.

It was Mirabeau's voice, loud and resonant, that kept in check the growing rage of the murderous fanatics who swarmed therein. There is no doubt that he perceived at last the true nature and strength of the beast, which he had worked so long and so industriously to unchain.

In his last attempt to save the royal family by getting them out of Paris, he actually succeeded in shouting down all opposition in the Jacobin club. That evening he died by a sudden and violent illness ; and, as the author of *The Diamond Necklace* writes: "Louis was not ignorant that Mirabeau had been poisoned."

Thus, like Philippe Egalité, and later Danton and Robespierre, Mirabeau too was removed from the stage when his role had been played. We are reminded of the passage in Number 15 of the *Protocols of Zion* :

"We execute masons in such wise that none save the brotherhood can ever have a suspicion of it."

And again :

"In this way we shall proceed with those goy masons who know too much."

As Mr E. Scudder writes in his *Life of Mirabeau* :

"He died at a moment when the revolution might still have been checked."

The figure of Lafayette occupies the stage on several important occasions during these first revolutionary stages.

[32] He was one of those simple freemasons, who are borne they know not wither, in a ship they have not fully explored, and by currents concerning which they are totally ignorant.

While a popular figure with the revolutionary crowds, he very severely handled several incipient outbreaks of revolutionary violence, notably in the march of the women to Versailles, during the attack on the Tuilleries, and at the Champs de Mars. He, too, desired the establishment of a democratic monarchy, and would countenance no threat to the King even from Philippe Egalité, whom he treated with the utmost hostility during and after the march of the women to Versailles, believing on that occasion that Egalité intended the assassination of the King, and the usurpation of the Crown.

He evidently became an obstacle to the powers behind the revolution, and was packed off to a war against Austria, which the Assembly forced Louis to declare. Once he did dash back to Paris in an effort to save the King ; but he was packed off again to the war. Mirabeau's death followed, and Louis' fate was sealed.

The wild figures of Danton, Marat, Robespierre, and the fanatics of the Jacobin club now dominated the scene.

In September of 1792 were perpetrated the terrible "September massacres" ; 8,000 persons being murdered in the prisons of Paris alone, and many more over the country.

It should be noted here, that these victims were arrested and held till the time of the massacre in the prisons by one Manuel, Procureur of the Commune.

Sir Walter Scott evidently understood much concerning the influences which were at work behind the scenes. In his *Life of Napoleon*, Vol. 2, he writes on page 30 :

"The demand of the Commune de Paris, (<sup>4</sup>) now the *Sanhedrin* of the Jacobins, was, of course, for blood."

Again, on page 56 he writes :

[33] "The power of the Jacobins was irresistible in Paris, where Robespierre, Danton and Marat shared the high places in the *synagogue*."

Writing of the Commune, Sir Walter Scott states in the same work:

"The principal leaders of the Commune seem to have been foreigners."

Some of the names of these "foreigners" are worthy of note. There was Choderlo de Laclos, manager of the Palais Royal, said to be of Spanish origin. There was Manuel, the Procureur of the Commune, already mentioned. He it was who started the attack upon royalty in the Convention, which culminated with the execution of Louis and Marie Antoinette. There was David the painter, a leading member of the Committee of Public Security, which "tried" the victims. His voice was always raised calling for death. Sir Walter Scott writes that this fiend used to preface his "bloody work of the day with the professional

---

<sup>4</sup> The Paris County Council, equivalent to the L.C.C. in London.

phrase, 'let us grind enough of the Red'."

David it was who inaugurated the Cult of the Supreme being ; and organized "the conducting of this heathen mummary, which was substituted for every external sign of rational devotion." (Sir Walter Scott, *Life of Napoleon*, Vol. 2.)

There were Reubel and Gohir, two of the five "Directors," who with a Council of Elders became the government after the fall of Robespierre, being known as the Directoire.

The terms "Directors" and "Elders" are, of course, characteristically Jewish.

One other observation should be made here ; it is that this important work by Sir Walter Scott in 9 volumes, revealing so much of the real truth, is practically unknown, is never reprinted with his other works, and is almost unobtainable.

Those familiar with Jewish technique will appreciate the full significance of this fact ; and the added importance it lends to Sir Walter Scott's evidence regarding the powers behind the French Revolution.

[34] To return to the scene in Paris. Robespierre now remains alone, and apparently master of the scenes ; but this again was only appearance. Let us turn to the *Life of Robespierre*, by one G. Renier, who writes as though Jewish secrets were at his disposal. He writes :

"From April to July 1794 (the fall of Robespierre) the terror was at its height. It was never the dictatorship of a single man, least of all Robespierre. Some 20 men (the Committees of Public Safety and of General Security) shared the power."

"On the 28th July, 1794," to quote Mr. Renier again, "Robespierre made a long speech before the Convention ... a philippic against ultra-terrorists — uttering vague general accusations. 'I dare not name them at this moment and in this place. I cannot bring myself entirely to tear asunder the veil that covers this profound mystery of iniquity. But I can affirm most positively that among the authors of this plot are the agents of that system of corruption and extravagance, the most powerful of all the means invented by foreigners for the undoing of the Republic ; I mean the impure apostles of atheism, and the immorality that is at its base'."

Mr Renier continues with all a Jew's satisfaction :

"Had he not spoken these words he might still have triumphed!"

In this smug sentence Mr Renier unwittingly dots the i's and crosses the t's, which Robespierre had left uncompleted.

Robespierre's allusion to the "corrupting and secret foreigners" was getting altogether too near the mark ; a little more and the full truth would be out.

At 2 a.m. that night Robespierre was shot in the jaw and early on the following day dragged to the guillotine.

Again let us recall Protocol 15:

"In this way we shall proceed with goy masons who know too much."

[35] *Note* : In a somewhat similar manner Abraham Lincoln was shot and killed by the Jew Booth on the evening of his pronouncement to his cabinet that he intended in future to finance U.S. loans on a debt free basis similar to the debt free money known as "Greenbacks," with which he had financed the Civil War.

[36]

### 3

## THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

Monsieur François Coty, the celebrated scent manufacturer, wrote in *Figaro* on 20th February, 1932 :

"The subsidies granted to the Nihilists at this period (1905-1917) by Jacob Schiff, of Kuhn Loeb and Co., New York, were no longer acts of isolated generosity. A veritable Russian terrorist organization had been set up at his expense. It covered Russia with its emissaries."

This creation of terrorist formations by Jews within a country marked down for revolution, whether they be called Nihilists or as in France in 1789, "Sacred Bands," or "Marseillais" ; or "Operatives," as in the Britain of Charles I, now stands revealed as standard technique. Jacob Schiff also financed Japan in her war against Russia 1904-5, as we learn from the *Jewish Encyclopedia*.

This war was immediately followed by an attempt at revolution on a considerable scale in Russia, which, however, proved abortive. The next attempt, during the Great War, met with complete success.

On the 3rd January, 1906, the Russian Foreign Minister supplied to Emperor Nicholas II a report on this revolutionary outbreak, which, as revealed in the *American Hebrew* of July 13th, 1918, contained the following passages :

"The events which took place in Russia in 1905 ... plainly indicate that the revolutionary movement ... has a definite international character ... the revolutionaries possess great quantities of arms imported from abroad and very considerable financial means ... one is bound to conclude that there are foreign capitalists' organizations interested in [37] supporting our revolutionary movement. If we add to the above that, as has been proved beyond any doubt, a very considerable part is played by Jews ... as ring-leaders in other organizations

as well as their own ... always the most bellicose element of the revolution ... we may feel entitled to assume that the above-mentioned foreign support of the Russian revolutionary movement comes from Jewish capitalist circles." [Jews should be read as International Zionists, Ed.]

The assumption in the foregoing report was indeed well justified. It was to be confirmed by an even more important official document penned at the height of the revolution itself, in 1918, by Mr Oudendyke, the representative of the Netherlands Government in St. Petersburg, who was in charge of British interests in Russia after the liquidation of our Embassy by the bolsheviks.

So important indeed was this report of Mr. Oudendyke's held to be by Mr. Balfour, to whom it was addressed, that it was set out in a British government white paper on bolshevism issued in April 1919. (*Russia No. 1.*) In it I have read the following passage :

**"I consider that the immediate suppression of bolshevism is the greatest issue now before the world, not even excluding the war which is still raging, and unless bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately it is bound to spread in one form or another over Europe, and the whole world, as it is organized and worked by Jews, who have no nationality, and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things."**

A still clearer light is thrown on these happenings by an article written on 12th April, 1919, in a paper called *The Communist*, at Kharkov, by one M. Cohen :

"The great Russian revolution was indeed accomplished by the hands of Jews. There are no Jews in the ranks of the Red Army as far as privates are concerned, but in the Committees, and in the Soviet organization as Commissars, the Jews are [38] gallantly leading the masses. The symbol of Jewry has become the symbol of the Russian proletariat, which can be seen in the fact of the adoption of the five-pointed star, which in former times was the symbol of Zionism and Jewry."

Mr. Fahey, in his important and authenticated work, *The Rulers of Russia*, is more specific, stating that in 1917 of the 52 persons who took over the direction in Russia, all but Lenin were Jews.

So thorough was the mass liquidation of all but hewers of wood and drawers of water in Russia, that this Jewish grip remained unaltered. Dr. Fahey tells us that in 1935 the Central Executive of the Third international, which ruled Russia "consisted of 59 men, of which 56 were Jews. The other three, including Stalin, were married to Jewesses. Of 17 principal Soviet ambassadors, 4 were

Jews." (*Rulers of Russia*, pages 8 and 9.)

The Rev. George Simons, who was Superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal Church in St. Petersburg from 1907 to October 1918, appeared before a Committee of the United States Senate on the 12th February, 1919, and gave them a report of his personal knowledge of the happenings in Russia up to the time he left. Dr. Fahey quotes him as saying during this evidence :

"In December, 1918, out of 388 members of the revolutionary government, only 16 happened to be real Russians ; all the rest were Jews with the exception of one U.S. Negro. Two hundred and sixty-five of the Jews come from the Lower East Side of New York."

Such has been the condition of affairs in the U.S.S.R. from that day to this.

Though a number of Jews were liquidated in the so-called "Moscow Purge," this affected the situation in no way. It merely signified that one Jewish faction had triumphed over, and liquidated, another. There has never been anything in the nature of a Gentile revolt against the Jewish domination.

[39] The fact that some Jews were liquidated by winning factions behind the iron curtain could be used to deceive the world outside into thinking that this was the result of an anti-semitic revolt, and from time to time a hoax of this kind has been systematically propagandized.

As world opinion gradually turned hostile to the U.S.S.R. important Jews began to fear, that this feeling, combined with a gradual realization that bolshevism is Jewish, might have unpleasant reactions for them. About 1945, therefore, a further powerful campaign was organized from influential Jewish circles, notably in the U.S.A., to put out the story once again that Russia had turned on the Jews. They evidently failed, however, to advise their lesser brethren of this move ; and indignant and informed denials were soon forthcoming. A journal called *Bulletin, the organ of the Glasgow Discussion Group*, wrote in June 1945 :

"Such rubbish as is now being spread as to the growth of anti-Semitism in Russia is nothing but malicious lies and pure invention."

On 1st February, 1949, the *Daily Worker* carried an article in which a Mr. Parker gave a few names and figures of Jews in high office in the U.S.S.R., from which he had evidently recently returned, for he wrote :

"I never heard a breath of criticism over this state of affairs," and stated

later in the same article "anti-Semitism would render a Soviet official liable to prosecution in the same way that a private citizen may be brought before the courts for anti-Semitism."

On the 10th November, 1949, the *Daily Worker*, that constant and burning champion of the Jews, printed an article by Mr D. Kartun, entitled "Stamping Out Anti-Semitism," which shows the complete Jewish control behind the iron curtain when he writes :

"In Poland and the other people's democracies anti-Semitism in word or deed is most heavily punished."

Between 1945 and 1949 the propaganda to convince [40] Gentiles outside the ironcurtain, that within that area anti-Semitism was rampant, and the Jews driven from high office everywhere was energetically pursued. It began to be believed by quite a number of people, who would have known better ; so much so, that in the autumn of the latter year I thought it worth while to get out a list showing the number of vital positions held by Jews behind the iron curtain. Here is an extract from those lists.

U.S.S.R.:

Premier — Stalin .....	Married to a Jewess
Vice-Premier — Kaganovitch .....	Jew
Ministry of State Control — Mekhlis .....	Jew
Military & Naval Construction — Ginsburg .....	Jew
Minister Cominform Organ — Yudin .....	Jew
Chief Publicist Abroad for U.S.S.R. — Ilya Eherenburg ....	Jew
Ministry of Building Enterprises Machinery — Yudin .....	Jew
Foreign Minister — Molotoff .....	Married to a Jewess

POLAND:

Virtual Ruler — Jacob Bergman .....	Jew
Public Prosecutor — T. Cyprian .....	Jew
O.C. Youth Movements — Dr. Braniewsky .....	Jew

HUNGARY:

Virtual Ruler — Mathias Rakosi .....	Jew
--------------------------------------	-----

ROUMANIA:

Virtual Ruler — Anna Pauker .....	Jewess
-----------------------------------	--------

(Since removed for "deviationism" but replaced by another Jew.)



YUGOSLAVIA:

Virtual Ruler — Moishe Pyjede .....Jew

In May 1949, the *Daily Worker*, which is, of course, consistently and ardently pro-Jewish, printed an article by Mr A. Rothstein praising the U.S.S.R. to the skies ; and about [41] the same time another article on similar lines about the paradise behind the iron curtain by Mr Sam Aronvitch.

On the 10th November the same paper printed an article in which D. Kartun, writing of the "People's Democracies" and the stamping out of anti-Semitism there, wrote :

"No one could dream of making an anti-semitic speech or writing an anti-semitic article in any of these countries. If they did their jail sentence would be both immediate and lengthy."

In the last few years we have been supplied with further dramatic proof of the vital inter-relation between Jews and the U.S.S.R. From the Canadian spy trials, which focused the spotlight on atom spying for the U.S.S.R., with the conviction and imprisonment of Frank Rosenberg (alias Rose), the Canadian Jew Communist Member of Parliament, and several Jews, to the conviction and imprisonment of many others of the same gang in Britain and the U.S.A., including Fuchs, Professor Weinbaum, Judith Coplon, Harry Gold, David Greenglass, Julius Rosenberg, Miriam Moskewitz, Abraham Brothanz, and Raymond Boyer, who, though a Gentile by birth, married a Jewess and, I believe, adopted the Jewish creed on that occasion.

Finally, we had the flight to the U.S.S.R. with atom secrets also of the Jew Professor Pontecorvo, who had been working in close association with Fuchs.

No doubt we shall continue to be regaled with plausible stories proving that Russia has gone anti-semitic ; but it is not hard to realise that such a Jewish grip backed by the most elaborate spy and liquidation squads known to man, would cause a convulsion which would shake the world before its grip could be broken.

[42]

## 4

### DEVELOPMENT OF REVOLUTIONARY TECHNIQUE

Four revolutions in history merit our special attention. The study and comparison of the methods employed therein will reveal on the one hand a basic similarity between them: and on the other an interesting advance in technique, with each succeeding upheaval.

It is as if we studied the various stages in the evolution of the modern rifle from the original old "brown Bess."

The revolutions in question are firstly the Cromwellian, secondly the French, thirdly the Russian, and lastly the Spanish revolution of 1936. All four can be proved to have been the work of international Jewry. The first three succeeded, and secured the murder of the reigning monarch and the liquidation of his supporters.

In each case Jewish finance, and underground intrigue, are clearly traceable ; and the earliest measures passed by the revolutionaries have been "emancipation" for the Jews.

Cromwell was financed by various Jews, notably Manasseh Ben Israel and Carvajal "the Great Jew," contractor to his army.

On this occasion Jewish influence remained financial and commercial, while the propaganda weapons and medium were semi-religious, all the Cromwellians being soaked in Old Testament Judaism ; some, such as General Harrison, even carried their Judaism to the length of advocating the adoption of the Mosaic Law as the law of England, and the substitution of Saturday as the Sabbath in place of the Christian Sunday.

[43] We are all familiar with the absurd Old Testament passages which the Roundhead rank and file adopted as names, such as Sergeant Obadiah, "Bind their Kings in chains and their nobles in fetters of iron."

The Cromwellian revolution was short-lived. The work of destruction had not been sufficiently thorough to frustrate counter-revolution, and restoration of the old regime.

A second revolution, the so-called "Glorious Revolution" of 1689, was necessary. This again was financed by Jews, notably Solomon Medina, Suasso, Moses Machado and others.

By the French revolution of 1789 the technique had been notably improved. Secret societies had been developed throughout France on a grand scale in the preceding years. The plans for the liquidation of the former regime are by this time far more drastic. The judicial murder of a kindly and well intentioned King and a few nobles is replaced by mass murders in prisons and in private houses of the whole of the nobility, clergy, gentry and bourgeoisie, regardless of sex.

The Cromwellian damage and desecration of a few churches by their temporary use as stables is developed into a general wrecking of Christian churches, or their conversion into public lavatories, brothels, and markets ; and the banning of the practice of the Christian religion and even the ringing of church bells.

Civil war is not allowed to develop. The army is side-tracked, and kept apart from its King by his seizure at an early stage. So powerful is the unseen control by 1789 that apparently, the dregs of the French population victoriously liquidate all their natural leaders, in itself a most unnatural and suspicious phenomenon.

More suspicious still is the sudden appearance of strong bands of armed hooligans, who march on Paris from Lyons and Marseilles ; and are recorded as being obviously [44] foreigners. Here we have the first formations of alien mercenary and criminal elements, forcing revolutions upon a country not their own, which were to have their finished and expanded prototype in the International Brigades, which attempted to force Marxism on Spain 150 years later.

England in the 17th century had not been dismembered and hideously remoulded on alien lines ; but all familiar land marks in 18th century France were destroyed. The splendid and historic names and titles of counties,

departments and families were scrapped, and France divided into numbered squares occupied merely by "citizens." Even the months of the calendar were changed. The national flag of France with its lilies and its glories was banned. Instead the French received the Tricolour, badge of murder and rapine. Here, however, the planners made a mistake.

The tricolour might not be the honoured and famous flag of France. It might be dripping with the blood of massacre, regicide and villainy. It might be stinking with the slime of the Jewish criminals who designed and foisted it upon the French people ; but it was proclaimed the national flag, and the national flag it became ; and with the national flag came the national army, and a national leader, Napoleon. It was not long before this great Frenchman ran up against the secret powers, who up till then controlled the armies of France. They had planned to use these armies to revolutionise all European states, one after another ; to overthrow all leadership, and establish rule of the mob, apparently, in reality of course their own.

Just in this manner do the Jews today plan to use the Red Army. Such a policy directed by aliens of this type could not long continue once a national army had thrown up a real national leader ; their outlook and policy must inevitably be poles apart. It was not long before the First Consul challenged and overthrew these aliens and their puppets.

[45] By the year 1804 Napoleon had come to recognise the Jew and his plans as a menace to France and all that the revolution had swept away he systematically restored. From this time onwards Jewish money financed every coalition against him ; and Jews today boast that it was Rothschild rather than Wellington who defeated Napoleon. Knowing these things, Hitler, on his occupation of Paris, immediately ordered a permanent guard of honour to be mounted over Napoleon's tomb at the Invalides ; and had the body of L'Aiglon (Napoleon's son by Maria Louisa) brought from Austria, and buried at last in his proper place at the side of his father.

When we come to examine the Russian revolution we find that the technique is still bolder and far more drastic. On this occasion no national flag, army, or anthem is permitted. After the dregs of the community have apparently accomplished the impossible, and liquidated every other class down to and including the *kulak* (a man with three cows), they are herded into a polygot force called the Red Army ; over them waves an international red flag, not a Russian flag ; their anthem is the Internationale.

The technique of revolution in Russia was so perfected that to this day it has secured the Jewish regime established there against all counter strokes.

The next revolution to merit our attention is the one that broke out in Spain in 1936. Fortunately for Europe, it was frustrated by General Franco and a number of gallant men, who instantly took the field in opposition to the revolutionary forces, and succeeded in a long struggle in crushing them.

This achievement is all the more remarkable in view of the latest development in revolutionary organisation, which was then revealed in the shape of the International Brigades. These International Brigades, besides representing the very [46] latest novelty in revolutionary technique, were a remarkable production. They were recruited from criminals, adventurers and dupes, mostly communists, from 52 different countries, mysteriously transported and assembled in formations in Spain within a few weeks of the outbreak of disorder, uniformed in a garb closely related to our battle dress, and armed with weapons bearing the Jewish five-pointed star. This star and the Seal of Solomon were upon the signet rings of N.C.O.s and Officers in this communist horde of ill-disciplined ruffians. I have seen them myself in wear.

By October 1936 these International Brigades were already assembled in Spain in considerable numbers. Undisciplined and blackguardly though they were, the mere fact of a large and well-armed political army, intervening suddenly on one side in the early stages of a civil war, might reasonably have been counted upon to achieve a decision before the patriotic and decent element in the country could have time to create an adequate fighting machine.

Though the British public were kept in total ignorance as to the true significance of what was taking place in Spain two countries in Europe were alive to the situation. Germany and Italy had each in their turn experienced the throes of communist revolution, and emerged victorious over this foulest of earthly plagues. They knew who had financed and organised the International Brigades ; and with what fell purpose Barcelona had been declared in October 1936 the Capital of the Soviet States of Western Europe. At the critical moment they intervened in just sufficient strength to counter the International Brigade, and enable the Spanish people to organise their own army, which, in due course, easily settled the matter. Settled the matter, that is to say, as far as Spain was concerned. There was, however, another settlement to come. International Jewry had been seriously thwarted. They would not rest henceforward until they could [47] have their revenge ; until they could by hook or crook turn the guns of the rest of the world against these two States, which in addition to thwarting their designs in Spain were in the process of placing Europe upon a system independent of gold and usury, which, if permitted to develop, would break the Jewish power for ever.

[48]

## 5

### GERMANY BELLS THE CAT

The urgent alarm sounded in 1918 by Mr. Oudendyke in his letter to Mr. Balfour, denouncing bolshevism as a Jewish plan, which if not checked by the combined action of the European Powers, would engulf Europe and the world, was no exaggeration. By the end of that year the red flag was being hoisted in most of the great cities of Europe. In Hungary the Jew Bela Kun organised and maintained for some time a merciless and bloody tyranny similar to the one in Russia. In Germany, the Jews Liebknecht, Barth, Scheidemann, Rosa Luxemburg, etc., made a desperate bid for power. These and other similar convulsions shook Europe ; but each country in its own way just frustrated the onslaughts.

In most countries concerned a few voices were raised in an endeavour to expose the true nature of these evils. Only in one, however, did a political leader and group arise, who grasped to the full the significance of these happenings, and perceived behind the mobs of native hooligans the organisation and driving power of world Jewry. This leader was Adolf Hitler, and his group the National Socialist Party of Germany.

Never before in history had any country not only repulsed organised revolution, but discerned Jewry behind it, and faced up to that fact. We need not wonder that the sewers of Jewish vituperation were flooded over these men and their leader ; nor should we make the mistake of supposing that Jewry would stick at any lie to deter honest men everywhere from making a thorough investigation of the facts for themselves. [49] Nevertheless, if any value liberty, and set out to seek truth and defend it, this duty of personal investigation is one which they cannot shirk.

To accept unquestioningly the lies and misrepresentations of a Jew-

controlled or influenced press, is to spurn truth by sheer idleness, if for no worse reason. To act on such unverified a basis is to sin against the Light. In the case of Germany and Hitler the task of research is not difficult. We have it on many authorities that Hitler's book, *Mein Kampf*, stated fully and accurately the author's observations and conclusions concerning all these vital matters. Quite false pictures have been propagated deliberately about this book, by quoting passages out of their context, distorting meanings, and downright misrepresentation. Having read many of these unscrupulous diatribes, it was with no little surprise that I read this book for myself not so very long ago.

From many conversations I had heard and taken part in, I now realise that most members of the public were as ignorant as I of the real nature of this remarkable book. I propose, therefore, to try and give a true picture of its spirit and purport by quotations from its two main themes: Firstly realisation and exposure of the Jewish scheme for world Marxism ; and secondly, admiration of, and longing for friendship with Great Britain.

Writing of the days before 1914, Hitler states:

"I still saw Jewry as a religion ... Of the existence of deliberate Jewish hostility I had no conception ... I gradually realised that the Social Democratic Press was preponderantly controlled by Jews ... There was not a single paper with which Jews were connected which could be described as genuinely national ... I seized all the Social Democratic pamphlets I could get hold of, and looked up the names of their authors — nothing but Jews."

As he pursued the study of these questions, Hitler began to perceive the main outlines of the truth :

[50] "I made also a deep study of the relation between Judaism and Marxism ... The Jewish State never had boundaries as far as space was concerned ; it was unlimited as regards space, but bound down by its conception of itself as a race. That people, therefore, was always a State within a State ... The Jewish doctrine of Marxism rejects the aristocratic principle in nature... denies the value of the individual among men, combats the importance of nationality and race, thereby depriving humanity of the whole meaning of existence."

"Democracy in the west today is the forerunner of Marxism, which would be inconceivable without Democracy." "If the Jew, with the help of his Marxian creed, conquers the nations of the world, his crown will be the funeral wreath of the human race ..." "Thus did I now believe," he writes of the days of 1918, "that by defending myself against the Jews I am doing the Lord's work."



At the end of 1918 there came the revolution in Germany organised behind the unbroken army in the field. Concerning this Hitler wrote:-

"In November sailors arrived in lorries, and called on us all to revolt, a few Jewish youths being the leaders in that struggle for the 'freedom, beauty and dignity of our national life'. Not one of them had ever been to the Front."

"The real organiser of the revolution and its actual wire-puller the International Jew ... The revolution was not made by the forces of peace and order ; but by those of riot, robbery and plunder."

"I was beginning to learn afresh, and only now (1919) came to a right comprehension of the teachings and intentions of the Jew Karl Marx. Only now did I properly understand his *Kapital* ; and equally also the struggle of Social Democracy against the economics of the nation ; and that its aim is to prepare the ground for the domination of the truly international Kapital."

Emperor to offer the hand of friendship to the leaders of [51] Marxism ... While they held the Imperial hand in theirs the other hand was already feeling for the dagger." "With the Jew there is no bargaining ; there is merely the hard 'either, or'."

Later on Hitler gives in great detail the outlines of the Jewish disruptive machine.

"By means of the Trades Unions which might have been the saving of the nation, the Jew actually destroys the nation's economics."

"By creating a press which is on the intellectual level of the least educated, the political and labour organisation obtains force of compulsion enabling it to make the lowest strata of the nation ready for the most hazardous enterprises."

"The Jewish press ... tears down all which may be regarded as the prop of a nation's independence, civilisation and its economic autonomy. It roars especially against characters who refuse to bow the knee to Jewish domination, or whose intellectual capacity appears to the Jew in the light of a menace to himself."

"The ignorance displayed by the mass ... and the lack of instinctive perception of our upper class make the people easy dupes of this campaign of Jewish lies."

"But the present day is working its own ruin ; it introduces universal suffrage, chatters about equal rights, and can give no reason for so thinking. In its eyes material rewards are the expression of a man's worth, thus shattering the basis for the noblest equality that could possibly exist."



"It is one of the tasks of our Movement to hold out prospects of a time when the individual will be given what he needs in order to live ; but also to maintain the principle that man does not live for material enjoyment alone."

"The political life of today alone has persistently turned its back on this principle of nature" (i.e. quality) ... "

"Human civilisation is but the outcome of the creative force of personality in the community as a whole, and especially among its leaders ... the principle of the dignity [52] of the majority is beginning to poison all life below it ; and in fact to break it up."

"We now see that Marxism is the enunciated form of the Jewish attempt to abolish the importance of personality in all departments of human life ; and to set up the mass of numbers in its place ... "

"The principle of decision by majorities has not always governed the human race ; on the contrary, it only appears during quite short periods of his tory, and those are always periods of decadence in nations and States."

"We must not forget that the international Jew, who continues to dominate over Russia, does not regard Germany as an ally, but as a State destined to undergo a similar fate."

On the last page and in almost the last paragraph of *Mein Kampf* is the following :

"The party as such stands for positive Christianity, but does not bind itself in the matter of creed to any particular confession. It combats the Jewish materialistic spirit within us and without us." Looking round the world for help in the battle against this terrible menace of Jew directed bolshevism, Hitler's mind constantly reverted to Britain and the British Empire. He always longed for their friendship. Always declared Britain to be one of the greatest bulwarks against chaos ; and that her interests and those of Germany were complementary and not contrary to one another.

"It was not a British interest," he wrote, "but in the first place a Jewish one to destroy Germany." And again:- "Even in England there is a continual struggle going on between the representatives of British state interests and the Jewish world dictatorship."

"Whilst England is exhausting herself in maintaining her position in the world, the Jew is organising his measures for its conquest ... Thus the Jew today is a rebel in England, and the struggle against the Jewish world menace will be started there also."

"No sacrifice would have been too great in order to gain England's alliance. It would have meant renunciation of the colonies and importance at sea, and refraining from interference with British industry by competition."

In later years these two themes were ceaselessly expounded ; viz., the Jewish Marxist menace, and the eagerness for friendship with Britain. Even down to, and including Dunkirk, Hitler pressed the latter idea on all and sundry ; even on his highest Generals, to their astonishment. Nor did he stop at words, as will be shown later when, as Liddell Hart informs us, he saved the British Army from annihilation by halting the Panzer Corps, informing his Generals the while, that he regarded the British Empire and the Catholic Church as necessary bulwarks of peace and order which must be safeguarded. (<sup>5</sup>)

*Mein Kampf* was first published in October 1933. Before it had left the printers, the floodgates of Jewish hatred and lies had been full-opened against Hitler and the Third Reich all over the world. English-speaking people everywhere were deluged with fabrications, distortions and atrocity stories, which drowned the voices of the few who understood the real situation.

Forgotten in the turmoil was Marx's slogan that before bolshevism could triumph the British Empire must be destroyed ; and totally suppressed as far as the British people were concerned was Hitler's repeated declaration of his willingness to defend the British Empire if called upon to assist by force of arms if necessary.

---

<sup>5</sup> *The Other Side of the Hill*, Chap. X, by Liddell Hart.

[54]

## 6

### 1933 : JEWRY DECLARES WAR

The English edition of *Mein Kampf* was still in the process of printing and publication when Jewry declared war on the national Socialist regime, and started an intensive blockade against Germany.

The International Jewish Boycott Conference was assembled in Holland in the summer of 1933 under the Presidency of Mr. Samuel Untermyer, of the U.S.A., who was elected President of the World Jewish Economic Federation formed to combat the opposition to Jews in Germany. On his return to the U.S.A., Mr. Untermyer gave an address over Station W.A.B.C., the text of which, as printed in the *New York Times* of August 7th, 1933, I have before me. Mr Untermyer referred in the opening phrases to : "The holy war in the cause of humanity in which we are embarked" ; and proceeded to develop the subject at great length, describing the Jews as the aristocrats of the world. "Each of you, Jew and Gentile alike, who has not already enlisted in this sacred war should do so now and here." Those Jews who did not join in he denounced, declaring : "They are traitors to their race."

In January 1934 Mr. Jabotinsky, founder of Revisionist Zionism, wrote in *Natcha Retch* :

"The fight against Germany has been carried out for months by every Jewish community, conference, trade organisation, by every Jew in the world ... we shall let loose a spiritual and a material war of the whole world against Germany."

This is perhaps the most confident assertion extant on the Jewish claim, set out in the *Protocols of Zion*, that they can bring about war.

[55] Protocol Number 7 states :

"We must be in a position to respond to every act of opposition by a State by war with its neighbour. If these should venture to stand collectively, by universal war."

It should be remembered here that a copy of these *Protocols* was filed in the British Museum in 1906.

By 1938 the Jewish war was in full swing ; and already through their influence or pressure many Gentile persons and groups were being drawn into the vortex. Various members of the British Socialist Party were openly advocating joining in this cold war ; and a vigorous and uncompromising clique was growing in all Parties under the leadership of Messrs. Churchill, Amery, Duff, Cooper and others. "Hitler will have no war, but he will be forced to it, not this year, but later on," screamed the Jew Emil Ludwig in the June copy of *Les Aniles* 1934.

On June 3rd, 1938, matters were carried a long step further by an article in the *American Hebrew*, the weekly organ of American Jewry. This article, which opened by showing that Hitler never deviated from his *Mein Kampf* doctrine, went on to threaten the direst retaliation.

"It has become patent that a combination of Britain, France and Russia will sooner or later bar the triumphant march (of Hitler) ... Either by accident or design, a Jew has come to a position of foremost importance in each of these nations. In the hands of non-Aryans lies the fate and the very lives of millions ... In France the Jew of prominence is Leon Blum ... Leon Blum may yet be the Moses who will lead ... Maxim Litvinoff, Soviet super salesman, is the Jew who sits at the right hand of Stalin, the little tin soldier of communism ... The English Jew of prominence is Leslie Hore-Belisha, Tommy Atkins' new boss."

Later in this article we read:

"So it may come to pass that these three sons of Israel will form the combine that will send the frenzied Nazi dictator to hell. And when the [56] smoke of battle clears ... and the man who played the swastikaed Christus ... is lowered into a hole in the ground ... as the trio of non-Aryans intone a ramified requiem ... a medley of the marseillaise, God Save the King, and the Internationale, blending with a proud and aggressive rendering of Eili Eili."

Two points in the above extract are worthy of special note. Firstly, it is taken for granted that these three Jews will not for one moment think or act as anything but Jews ; and can be relied upon to guide their Gentile dupes to ruin in a plainly Jewish war ; secondly, should be noted the contemptuous reference to the "swastikaed Christus," which Jewry looks forward to burying ; and which

reveals by its classification the Jewish hatred of Christianity.

Meantime Jewish pressure was exerted to the utmost to incite clashes between Sudeten, Czechs, Poles and Germans. By September of 1938 matters had reached a desperate pass. Mr. Chamberlain himself flew out to Munich and achieved the historic settlement with Hitler. It seemed as though the war mongers had been frustrated, and Europe saved. Rarely had such scenes and evidences of spontaneous delight and thankfulness been evoked as were witnessed throughout Britain and Europe at that triumph.

Those who knew the power of the enemy, however, knew that Mr Chamberlain's work was certain to be swiftly sabotaged. I remember remarking, on the very evening of his return from Munich, that within a week every newspaper in this country and the war mongers in Parliament, would be attacking Mr. Chamberlain for having secured peace ; regardless of the fact that in so doing they were contemptuously flouting the real wishes of the people. This remark was only too true, as events proved.

Nowhere was the Jewish fury so obvious, of course, as in Moscow. I have before me a leaflet of my own designing put out in October 1938. It runs :

[58] "Are you aware that Mr. Chamberlain was burnt in effigy in Moscow as soon as it was known that he had secured peace ; Showing very clearly Who Wanted War, and who are still ceaselessly working to stir up strife all the world over." <sup>(6)</sup> The attempt to provoke war over Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia having failed, there remained only the detonator in the Polish Corridor, that monstrosity born of the unholy Versailles Conference, and denounced by honest men from Marshal Foch and Arthur Henderson, from that time onwards.

One feature about the Versailles Conference has been kept secret by those who possess the power to keep things from the public or to proclaim things from the house tops. It is this: All important decisions were taken by the "Big Four" - Britain, France, Italy and the U.S.A., represented respectively by Mr. Lloyd George, M. Clemenceau, Baron Sonino and President Wilson. So much is known. What is not known is that the secretary of Mr. Lloyd George was the Jew Sassoon ; of M. Clemenceau the Jew Mandel Rothschild, now known as Mandel ; Baron Sonino was himself half a Jew: and President Wilson had the Jew Brandeis ; the interpreter was another Jew named Mantoux ; and the Military Adviser yet another Jew called Kish.

It is known that Mr. Lloyd George and others were hazy about geography.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Appendix 4.

Their Jewish secretaries, however, were on the contrary very much on the spot on such matters. These Jews met at 6 p.m. in the evenings ; and mapped out the decisions for the following day's conference of the "Big Four."

The results were disastrous from the point of view of all decent people, who hoped for an honourable treaty, with terms which, though they might be stringent, would at least be just and thereby secure lasting peace.

Foch himself loudly denounced the treaty ; declaring [58] that it contained the certain makings of another war and deprecating in particular the provision relating to Danzig and the Corridor. Arthur Henderson and many public men joined in the denunciation ; but all to no avail.

From the point of view of men planning another war, however, nothing could have been better than this treaty. All sorts of glaring injustices were ingrained in its text. In addition to the Corridor, and the position at Danzig, a bastard State was brought into being, in which Germans, Slovaks, etc., together forming a majority of the country, were put under the tyrannical control of the Czech minority, an element which had thrown in its lot with the bolshevik Jews and fought against the Allies in 1918.

The design of this State was such geographically that it was styled, and correctly styled, a dagger pointed at the heart of Germany. It received the outlandish name of Czechoslovakia. The whole of the industrial life from the huge Skoda arsenal downwards was controlled by Jewish banking interests ; while we have it on the evidence of Lord Winterton that practically all the land was mortgaged to the Jews (*Hansard*, October 1936). Under this Messianic domination were enslaved huge sections of populations, belonging to other nations, henceforward condemned to be held down by force until some country should grow strong enough to champion them.

This eventuality was, in my opinion, visualised and actually fostered as we know by the huge loans to Germany from international banking interests. (<sup>7</sup>) Let it not be forgotten that while Jewish bankers were pouring money into Germany which was rebuilding the Wehrmacht on a bigger scale than ever, a colossal campaign for peace and disarmament was launched in this country. This not only succeeded in substantially disarming us ; but in creating an atmosphere in which Mr. Baldwin had to admit that he dared not go to the country asking for more armaments, vital though he knew [59] our needs in sea, air and land forces to be.

To anyone who made a study of the personalities and powers behind this

---

<sup>7</sup> All prior of course to the rise of Hitler.

so-called peace propaganda, as I did, there can be no doubt as to whence the real drive and finance emanated. To anyone appreciating the attitude of the press at that time, and realising that had this disarmament propaganda been distasteful to those who influence our publicity services, there would have blared forth a torrent of invective against our "peace ballotters" ; there is additional proof that this campaign had the support of international Jewry, as had the rearmament of Germany. But why ? the simple will ask.

The answer is fairly simple, if once the purpose behind the Jewish plan is understood. "Out of the last war we brought the Soviet States of Russia ; out of the next war we will bring the Soviet States of Europe," had been the pronouncement at a world meeting of communist parties about 1932. To make the next war possible, therefore, the see-saw must be balanced again ; German strength built up, and British strength whittled down. Then the Europeans can fight each other to the death of one and complete exhaustion of the other. A dramatic surprise is in store for both sides. Neither is to be the real winner. The real winner is quite a different army. This army is the one that will receive the real attention. For 25 years it will be built up under conditions of the greatest secrecy. Its leaders will not show their strength until the conflict is well under way. Not until a critical moment in the war will the European armies be permitted to guess at the existence of the huge factories beyond the Urals, or of the colossal proportions of the heavily mechanised hordes which will then commence to roll westwards over Europe under the red flag of Marxism.

In March 1939 a British guarantee to Poland was given by Mr Chamberlain on the strength of a false report to the effect that a 48-hour ultimatum had been delivered by [60] Germany to the Poles. This report subsequently turned out to be quite untrue. The guarantee had been given, however, and the decision of peace or war was now no longer in British hands. Jewry had the ball at its feet. Can we doubt but that Poland was encouraged to ignore the German note of March which set forth eminently reasonable suggestions for a peaceful solution of the problem of the Corridor ?

Month after month no reply was vouchsafed by Poland to the German note. Meanwhile, insult and outrage occurred with suspicious frequency all along the German frontier, similar to the technique to which the Jews later introduced the British in Palestine. Day after day the British public was deluged with war propaganda and misrepresentation of the situation. Finally their minds were closed against any further regard to the demands of justice or reason by a new slogan, "You cannot trust Hitler's word." With this lie the British public was finally stampeded into throwing all reason and judgement to the winds and accepting at their face value the war propaganda in the press.



This slogan was founded upon a misrepresentation of Hitler's assurance given on more than one occasion after a "putsch" such as that into Sudetenland, that he "intended to make no further demands." The misrepresentation lay in the fact that the press steadily obscured the major fact, that the "demands" to which Hitler referred were all along five fold in character ; and covered those five areas taken from Germany by a dictated peace in which the population was overwhelmingly German, i.e. Sudetenland, part of Czechoslovakia, parts of Poland, the Corridor and Danzig.

As German troops occupied each successive section, it is, I believe, accurate to say that Hitler declared, that he had no additional demands to make. But here it must be clearly stated in the interests of justice that he never said that this entailed reducing the demands which he had originally very clearly delineated, and repeated on many occasions, [61] namely, the five areas in question.

The British public was deluded by its press into supposing that when Hitler said he had no further demands, that there had never been any statement of his full demands, some of which were still unfulfilled. They were led to believe that Hitler either never had any other demands, or that he had abandoned the rest as soon as he had obtained some of them. When, therefore, the next instalment was added, the press built on this misunderstanding the fallacy that Hitler's word could not be trusted. Honest dealing needs no such trickery and deception. Such methods are only necessary to bolster up bad or unjust causes. Fortunately we have the calm and dispassionate judgement in this matter by no less a person than the late Lord Lothian, recently British Ambassador to the U.S.A. In his last speech at Chatham House on this subject he remarked: "If the principle of self-determination had been applied in Germany's favour, as it was applied against her, it would have meant the return of Sudetenland, Czechoslovakia, parts of Poland, the Polish Corridor, and Danzig to the Reich."

Here is a very different presentment of the case to the one which was foisted upon the British public in 1939 ; and it is the true one. Small wonder that these facts had to be withheld from the ordinary citizen.

Had the British public realised the truth, that each of these demands of Hitler's rested on a foundation of reasonable fairness, the people of this island would have ruled out any question of war ; and it was war, not truth or justice, upon which international Jewry was resolved.



[62]

## 7

### "PHONEY WAR" ENDED BY CIVILIAN BOMBING

Though a state of war was declared to exist between Britain and Germany in September of 1939, it very soon became apparent that no war was being conducted by Germany against this country. This was no surprise to those who knew the facts of the case. Hitler had again and again made it clear, that he never intended to attack or harm Great Britain or the British Empire. With the Siegfried Line strongly held, and no German intention of appearing west of it, stalemate in the west, or the "Phoney War," as it came to be called, must, in the absence of bombing of civilian populations ultimately peter out altogether. No one was quicker to perceive this than the pro-Jewish war mongers ; and they and their friends inside and outside the House of Commons very soon began exerting pressure for this form of bombing of Germany to be started.

On 14th January, 1940, The *Sunday Times* gave prominence to a letter from an anonymous correspondent, who demanded to know why we were not using our air power "to increase the effect of the blockade." "Scrutator," in the same issue, commented on this letter as follows :

"Such an extension of the offensive would inevitably develop into competitive frightfulness. It might be forced on us in reprisals for enemy action, and we must be in a position to make reprisals if necessary. But the bombing of industrial towns, with its unavoidable loss of life among the civilian population — that is what it would come to — would be inconsistent with the spirit, if not the actual words of the *pledges given from* [63] *both sides* at the beginning of the war."

The above quotation is taken from a book entitled [\*Bombing Vindicated, which was published in 1944 by Mr. J. M. Spaight\*](#), C.B., C.B.E., who was the principal assistant secretary at the Air Ministry during the war. As its title

suggests, this book is an attempt to justify the indiscriminate use of bombers against the civil population. In it Mr. Spaight boasts that this form of bombing "saved civilisation": and reveals the startling fact that it was Britain that started this ruthless form of war on the very evening of the day on which Mr. Churchill became Prime Minister, May 11th, 1940.

On page 64 of his book, Mr. Spaight gives a further piece of information, which renders this sudden change of British policy all the more astonishing ; for he states that a declaration was made by the British and French Governments on 2nd September, 1939, that "Only strictly military objectives in the narrowest sense of the word would be bombarded."

This declaration, of course, was made in the days of Mr Chamberlain's Premiership ; and no single fact perhaps could demarcate and differentiate more clearly the difference in the character and behaviour between Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Churchill.

On the 27th January, 1940, thirteen days after the letter in *The Sunday Times* already quoted, *The Daily Mail* endorsed editorially the views which had been expressed in that issue by "Scrutator" ; and it devoted a leading article, writes Mr. Spaight, to combating the suggestion of Mr. Amery and others that we should start the bombing of Germany. Sir Duff Cooper had written on the previous day in the same paper that "there would appear to exist a kind of unwritten truce between the two belligerents, according to the tacit terms of which they do not bomb one another."

In view of the declaration by Britain and France [64] of September 2nd, 1939, that they would "only bomb military objectives in the narrowest sense of the word," Sir Duff Cooper's verbiage about "a kind of unwritten truce," seems to me gravely obscurantist, if honest.

Inside the House of Commons, the pro-Jewish war mongers were now becoming more and more intransigent ; and more and more set on sabotaging the chances of turning the "phoney war" into a negotiated peace. This in spite of the fact that Britain had nothing to gain by further and total war, and everything to lose. The Jews, of course, had everything to lose by a peace which left the German gold-free money system and Jew-free Government intact, and nothing to gain.

It seemed clearer to me every day that this struggle over the question of civilian bombing was the crux of the whole matter ; and that by this method of warfare alone could the Jews and their allies cut the Gordian knot of stalemate leading to peace ; and probably later on to a joint attack on Jewish Bolshevism

in Russia.

Accordingly, on 15th February, 1940, I put down the following question to the Prime Minister :

Captain Ramsay asked the Prime Minister : "Whether he will assure the House that H.M. Government will not assent to the suggestions made to them, to abandon those principles which led them to denounce the bombing of civilian populations in Spain and elsewhere, and embark upon such a policy themselves ?"

Mr Chamberlain himself replied in outspoken terms :

"I am unaware of the suggestions to which my honourable and gallant friend refers. The policy of H.M. Government in this matter was fully stated by myself in answer to a question by the honourable Member for Bishop Auckland (Mr Dalton) on 14th September last. In the course of that answer I said that whatever be the length to which others may go, H.M. Government will never resort to the deliberate attack on women [65] and children, and other civilians, for purposes of mere terrorism. I have nothing to add to that answer."

Both this question and the reply were evidently distasteful in the extreme to the war mongers, so I resolved to carry the matter a stage further.

On 21st February I put down another question on the subject :

Captain Ramsay asked the Prime Minister: "Whether he is aware that the Soviet aeroplanes are carrying on a campaign of bombing civil populations, and whether H.M. Government have despatched protests on the subject similar to those despatched during the Civil War in Spain in similar circumstances ?"

Mr. Butler replied for the Prime Minister : "Yes, Sir. The Soviet Air Forces have pursued a policy of indiscriminate bombing, which cannot be too strongly condemned. H.M. Government have not, however, lodged any protest, since there are unfortunately no grounds for supposing that such action would achieve the result desired."

There can be little doubt but that these two downright answers crystallised the resolves of the war mongers to get rid of a Prime Minister whose adherence to an upright and humane policy must inevitably frustrate their plans, seeing that Hitler wished no war with Britain, and would therefore never start civilian bombing himself.

The machinery of intrigue and rebellion against Mr. Chamberlain was set

in motion. Ultimately he was saddled with the blame for the Norway blunder ; and this pretext was used by the Churchillian-cum-Socialist caucus to secure his downfall.

It should be remembered in this connection that prior to and during the Norway gamble, Mr. Churchill had been invested with full powers and responsibilities for all Naval Military and Air operations ; and if anyone therefore deserved to be broken over that second Gallipoli (pursued in defiance [66] of high naval authority warning that, without control of the Cattegat and Skaggerack it could not possibly succeed) it should have been the Minister responsible.

He however was not only unbroken, he was acclaimed Prime Minister. The man who would tear up the British pledge of September 2nd, 1939, and start bombing the civilians of Germany was the man for the war mongers who now ruled the roost.

And so civilian bombing started on the evening that the architect of the Norwegian fiasco became Prime Minister, viz., May 11th, 1940.

[67]

## 8

### DUNKIRK AND AFTER

Captain Liddell Hart, the eminent military critic, wrote a book on the military events of 1939-45, which was published in 1948, and entitled *The Other Side of the Hill*. Chapter 10 — which deals with the German invasion of France down to and including Dunkirk — bears the somewhat startling title, "How Hitler beat France and saved Britain." The reading of the chapter itself will astound all propaganda-blinded people, even more than the title: for the author therein proves that not only did Hitler save this country ; but that this was not the result of some unforeseen factor, or indecision, or folly, but was of set purpose, based on his long enunciated and faithfully maintained principle.

Having given details of how Hitler peremptorily halted the Panzer Corps on the 22nd May, and kept them inactive for the vital few days, till, in fact, the British troops had got away from Dunkirk, Captain Liddell Hart quotes Hitler's telegram to Von Kleist :

"The armoured divisions are to remain at medium artillery range from Dunkirk. Permission is only granted for reconnaissance and protective movements."

Von Kleist decided to ignore the order, the author tells us. To quote him again :

"Then came a more emphatic order, that I was to withdraw behind the canal. My tanks were kept halted there for three days."

In the following words the author reports a conversation which took place on May 24th (i.e. two days later) between Herr Hitler and Marshal Von Runstedt, and two key men [68] of his staff :

"He then astonished us by speaking with admiration of the British Empire,

of the necessity for its existence, and of the civilisation that Britain had brought into the world ... He compared the British Empire with the Catholic Church — saying they were both essential elements of stability in the world. He said that all he wanted from Britain was that she should acknowledge Germany's position on the continent. The return of Germany's lost colonies would be desirable, but not essential, and he would even offer to support Britain with troops, if she should be involved in any difficulties anywhere. He concluded by saying that his aim was to make peace with Britain, on a basis that she would regard compatible with her honour to accept."

Captain Liddell Hart comments on the above as follows :

"If the British Army had been captured at Dunkirk, the British people might have felt that their honour had suffered a stain, which they must wipe out. By letting it escape, Hitler hoped to conciliate them."

"This conviction of Hitler's deeper motive," he continues, "was confirmed by his strangely dilatory attitude over the subsequent plans for the invasion of England."

"He showed little interest in the plans," Blumentritt said, "and made no effort to speed up the preparation. That was utterly different to his usual behaviour. Before the invasion of Poland, of France, and later of Russia, he repeatedly spurred them on ; but on this occasion he sat back."

The author continues :

"Since the account of his conversation at Charleville, and subsequent holding back, comes from a section of the Generals, who had long distrusted Hitler's policy, that makes their testimony all the more notable."

And later he goes on to say :

"Significantly their account of Hitler's thoughts about England at the decisive hour before Dunkirk, fits in with much that he himself wrote earlier in *Mein Kampf* ; and it is remarkable how closely he followed his own Bible in other respects.

[69] Anyone who has read *Mein Kampf* will immediately appreciate the accuracy of the above statement. It is indeed if anything an understatement. Throughout that remarkable book runs two main themes, as I have shown in an earlier chapter — the one, a detailed delineation and denunciation of the Jewish Capitalist-Revolutionary machine ; the other, admiration for and eagerness for friendship with Britain and the Empire.

It is a pity, indeed, that so few persons in this island have read this book for themselves ; and it is a tragedy that they have instead swallowed wholesale, the

unscrupulous distortions and untrue propaganda on the subject, served up to them by Jewish publicity machinery, operating through our press and radio. Let these people but try and obtain a copy of that book ; and when they find they cannot, let them reflect, that if indeed its contents confirmed the lies that they have been told concerning it and its author, the powers behind our publicity would ensure that everyone should be able to secure a copy at the cheapest possible rate.

In any event, I would urge my countrymen to ponder most earnestly the following facts.

The Jew Karl Marx laid it down, that Bolshevism could never really succeed till the British Empire had been utterly destroyed.

Hitler laid it down, that the British Empire was an essential element of stability in the world ; and even declared himself ready to defend it with troops, if it should be involved in difficulties anywhere.

By unscrupulous propaganda on an unprecedented scale this country was led into destroying those who wished to be her friends, and offered their lives to defend her ; and exalting those, who proclaimed that her destruction was a necessary preliminary to the success of their ideology, forfeiting her Empire and her economic independence in the process.

[70]

## 9

### THE SHAPE OF THINGS TO COME

If the new-found knowledge of Hitler's anxiety to preserve the British Empire has come as a surprise recently to many people in this country, it must surely have come as a real shock to them to learn that President Roosevelt, on the other hand, was its inveterate enemy ; that he was not only a pro-communist of Jewish origin, but that before he brought America into the war he made it clear that he wished to break up the British Empire.

His son, Colonel Elliot Roosevelt, makes this last point very clear in his book, *As He Saw It*, recently published in the U.S.A.

On pages 19 to 28 of this book, Colonel Roosevelt tells us that in August 1941, his Father, having given out to the American people that he was going off on a fishing trip, actually proceeded to a meeting with Mr. Churchill on board a warship in Argentia Bay. Lord Beaverbrook, Sir Edward Cadogan, and Lord Cherwell (Professor Lindeman of doubtful race and nationality), and Mr. Averil Harriman were present, he says. On page 35 he quotes his Father as saying, "After the war ... there will have to be the greatest possible freedom of trade ... no artificial barriers." Mr. Churchill referred to the British Empire Trade Agreements, and Mr. Roosevelt replied, "Yes. Those Empire Trade Agreements are a case in point. It's because of them that the peoples of India, Africa, and of all the Colonial Near East are still as backward as they are ... I can't believe that we can fight a war against Fascist slavery, and at the same time not work to free people [71] all over the world from a backward colonial policy." "The peace," said Father firmly, "cannot include any continued despotism."



This insolent talk against the British Empire became so pronounced that on page 31 Colonel Roosevelt reports Mr.Churchill as saying, "Mr. President, I believe you are trying to do away with the British Empire." This comment was very near the mark, as the President had been talking about India, Burma, Egypt, Palestine, Indo-China, Indonesia, and all the African Colonies having to be "freed."

On page 115, the Colonel reports his Father as saying, "Don't think for a moment, Elliot, that Americans would be dying in the Pacific tonight if it hadn't been for the short-sighted greed of the French, the British and the Dutch. Shall we allow them to do it all over again ?"

These were not at all the reasons, however, given for the war, and for which Americans thought they were dying ; nor indeed does the President make any reference as to the pretexts given to his countrymen for the war.

The British, dying in greater numbers, have on the contrary been told that they are dying to defend their Empire from Hitler's wicked plans. Little do they suspect, that it is their so-called ally who plans its destruction.

"When we've won the war," the President is reported as saying on page 116, "I will see that the U.S.A. is not wheedled into any plans that will aid or abet the British Empire in its Imperialist ambitions."

And a few pages later:

"I have tried to make it clear to Winston and the others ... that they must never get the idea that we are in it just to help them hang on to the archaic and medieval Empire ideas."

Those who sup with the devil need a long spoon. Mr. Churchill, the self-styled "constant architect of the Jews' future," now found himself playing second fiddle to an even [72] more trusted architect ; so eminent, in fact, that he did not make any silly pretensions of respect for the British Empire. The earlier Moses, Karl Marx, had denounced the Empire long ago, and in the year 1941, it was only foolish opponents of Judaism and Marxism, like Herr Hitler, who were anxious to stand by that Empire, because they recognised it as a bulwark of Christian civilisation.

Although, as we have seen, Mr. Churchill is shown in this book as getting a little petulant from time to time over the President's pronouncements regarding the liquidation of the Empire, this did not prevent him from announcing himself

later to the House of Commons as "Roosevelt's ardent lieutenant." Under what special circumstances the King's Prime Minister could be an ardent lieutenant of a Republican President, whose design it was to destroy that Monarch's Empire, Mr. Churchill did not explain ; nor has he yet done so. On another occasion, Mr. Churchill made an equally cryptic remark: "It is no part of my duties," he assured the House of Commons, "to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire."

No, indeed ! Nor was it any part of his duties, on being told that it was to be liquidated, to pronounce himself to be the ardent lieutenant of the would-be liquidator. Nor, we might add, when Minister of Defence, with Admiralty and other codes at his disposal, was it any part of his duties, as Mr. Chamberlain's lieutenant, albeit not very ardent, to conduct a personal correspondence of the nature which he did conduct with President Roosevelt by means of the top secret code of the American Foreign Office.

[73]

## 10

### PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S ROLE

In my Statement to the Speaker and Members of the House of Commons concerning my detention (see Appendix 1) I summed up at the end of Part 1, the considerations which led me to inspect the secret U.S. Embassy papers at Mr. Tyler Kent's flat in the last weeks of Mr. Chamberlain's Premiership.

The first two of these six considerations were as follows :

1. Together with many members of both Houses of Parliament, I was fully aware that among the agencies both here and abroad, which had been actively engaged in promoting bad feeling between Great Britain and Germany, organised Jewry, for obvious reasons, had played a leading part.
2. I knew the U.S.A. to be the headquarters of Jewry, and therefore the real, though not apparent, centre of their activities.

It was not until 1948 that corroborative evidence of the foregoing from unimpeachable American sources came into my hands ; but when it did come, however, the authentic and fully documented character of the work left nothing to be desired. I refer to the book by Professor Charles Beard entitled *President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War 1941*, which was published by the Yale University Press in April 1948.

This book, which comes with all the authority of its eminent author, is nothing less than a tremendous indictment of President Roosevelt on three main issues.

Firstly, that he got himself elected on the strength of repeated promises, to the effect that he would keep the U.S.A. [74] out of any European war ; secondly, that he incessantly and flagrantly disregarded not only his promises to the American people, but all the laws of neutrality ; thirdly, that at a predetermined moment he deliberately converted this cold war, which he had been conducting, into a shooting war, by sending the Japanese an ultimatum, which no one could imagine could result in anything but immediate war.

From many instances given relating to the first issue, I quote one :

"At Boston on October 30th, 1940, he (F.D.R.) was even more emphatic, for there he declared :

'I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again: Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars' ;

and on December 29th :

'You can therefore nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth'."

Professor Beard goes on to prove that while Mr. Roosevelt was making these speeches, he was treating international laws of neutrality with total disregard, and in the interests only of those who were fighting the Jews' battles. The two main forms of non-shooting intervention were the convoying of U.S. ships of ammunition and supplies for the allies, and the Lend Lease Act.

Whatever be our sentiments in appreciating the help of the U.S. arsenals and navy under these two cold war decisions of Mr Roosevelt, no one can pretend that they were either in accordance with his pledges to the American people, or the fundamentals of international law regarding neutrality.

Some very plain speaking went on in Congress over these acts of the President's.

Representative U. Burdick, of North Dakota, said :

"All our aid to Britain may mean anything ... To sell her supplies is one thing ... to sell her supplies and convoy [75] them is another thing, to have actual war is the last thing — the last thing is inevitable from the first thing !"

Representative Hugh Paterson, of Georgia, said :

"It is a measure of aggressive war."

Representative Dewey Short, of Missouri, said :

"You cannot be half-way in war, and half-way out of war ... You can dress this measure up all you please (Lend, Lease), you can sprinkle it with perfume and pour powder on it ... but it is still foul and stinks to high heaven."

Representative Philip Bennett, of Missouri, declared :

"This conclusion is inescapable, that the President is reconciled to active military intervention if such intervention is needed to defeat the Axis in this war. But our boys are not going to be sent abroad, says the President. Nonsense, Mr Chairman ; even now their berths are being built in our transport ships. Even now the tags for identification of the dead and wounded are being printed by the firm of William C. Ballantyne and Co., of Washington."

Professor Beard proves the third point at great length, showing how at the appropriate moment President Roosevelt forced the Japanese into war by an ultimatum demanding instant compliance with terms, which could never have been accepted by any country.

"The memorandum which Senator Hull, with the approval of President Roosevelt, handed to Japan on 26th November, 1941 ... amounted to the maximum terms of an American policy for the whole Orient."

writes Professor Beard, and goes on to say :

"It required no profound knowledge of Japanese history, institutions, and psychology to warrant ... first that no Japanese Cabinet 'liberal or reactionary,' could have accepted the provisions."

and again later :

"The Japanese agent regarded the American memorandum as a kind of ultimatum. This much at least Secretary Hull knew on November 26th."

[76] Thus was the period of maximum intervention short of a shooting war terminated, and a save-face forged for Roosevelt to ship U.S. boys overseas without apparently breaking the spirit of his many promises.

As the war proceeded the real policy and sympathies of the President became more and more apparent. His deception of the British and their Allies was no less flagrant than his deception of the American people.

As Professor Beard points out on page 576 :

"The noble principles of the Four Freedoms, and the Atlantic Charter were

for practical purposes discarded in the settlements, which accompanied the progress and followed the conclusion of the war. To the validity of this statement the treatment of the people of Esthonia, Lithuania, Poland, Roumania, Yugoslavia, China, Indo-China, Indonesia, Italy, Germany and other places of the earth bear witness."

Some great driving force was clearly at work to induce a President of the United States so to act. We have seen from a previous chapter that it was not the preservation of the British Empire, nor the French Empire, nor the Dutch, that swayed the President. On the contrary, he had advised his ardent lieutenant, Mr. Churchill, at an early stage in the cold war that these must be liquidated. It was not Europe, nor the countries of Europe, nor their liberties, nor rights under the Atlantic Charter of Four Freedoms which weighed with him. We know now that the British and American armies were actually halted by General Ike Eisenhower under Mr. Roosevelt's rulings at the Yalta Conference, so that the Red Army of Jewish Bolshevism might overflow half Europe and occupy Berlin.

To quote again from Professor Beard :

"As a consequence of the war called necessary to overthrow Hitler's despotism,' another despotism was raised to a higher pitch of power."

In conclusion, Professor Beard condenses the many [77] indictments of the President set forth in his book, into 12 major counts, and declares :

"If these precedents are to stand unimpeached, and to provide sanctions for the continued conduct of America affairs — the Constitution may be nullified by the President and officers who have taken the oath and are under moral obligation to uphold it. For limited Government under supreme law they may substitute personal and arbitrary government — the first principle of the totalitarian system against which it has been alleged that World War II was waged — while giving lip service to the principle of constitutional government."

When we reflect upon the astounding contents of Professor Beard's book, and consider them in conjunction with the revelations in Colonel Roosevelt's *As He Saw It*, the question arises : whom, and which interests did President Roosevelt not betray. To this query I can only see one answer, namely, those people and their interests who planned from the start the use of United States arsenals and Forces to prosecute a war which would annihilate a Europe which had freed itself from Jewish gold and revolutionary control : people who planned to dissolve the British Empire, to forge chains of unrepayable debt, wherewith to coerce Britain to this end ; and to enable the Soviets to "bestride

Europe like a colossus," (<sup>8</sup>) in other words, International Jewry.

---

<sup>8</sup> These very words were used by General Smuts, who added words to the effect that he welcomed such a prospect. It should be remembered that General Smuts was formerly chief legal adviser to the Zionist Organisation in S. Africa.

[78]

## 11

### REGULATION 18B

On the 23rd May, 1940, within the first fortnight of Mr Churchill's Premiership, many hundreds of British subjects, a large proportion of them ex-Servicemen, were suddenly arrested and thrown into prison under Regulation 18B. For some days the entire press had been conducting a whirlwind campaign, in rising crescendo, against a supposed fifth column in this country, which was declared to be waiting to assist the Germans when they landed.

How untrue this campaign was, is proved by the fact that our most competent Intelligence Service never produced the flimsiest evidence of any such conspiracy, nor evidence of any plan or order relating to it, nor the complicity in such an undertaking of any single man arrested. Had such evidence been forthcoming, those implicated would undoubtedly have been charged and tried, and very properly so. But there was not one case of a man arrested under 18B being a British subject, who was so charged.

Four charges were actually framed against one lady, the wife of a distinguished Admiral, Mrs Nicholson. She was tried by a Judge and jury, and acquitted on all counts. This however, did not prevent her being arrested as she left the Law Courts, acquitted, and being thrown into Holloway Prison under Regulation 18B, where she remained for years.

Regulation 18B was originally introduced to deal with certain members of the I.R.A., who were committing a number of senseless minor outrages in London. Without this Regulation, no liege of His Majesty in the United Kingdom [79] could be arrested and held in prison on suspicion. This practice had long been abandoned in this country, except in short periods of grave



proven conspiracy, and on those occasions *Habeas Corpus* was always suspended.

18B enabled the medieval process of arrest and imprisonment on suspicion to be revived without the suspension of Habeas Corpus. It was, in fact, a return to the system of *Lettres de Cachet*, by which persons in pre-Revolutionary France were consigned to the Bastille. Here, it should be remembered, that those persons enjoyed full social intercourse with their families, and were allowed their own servants, plate, linen, food and drink whilst in prison ; a very different treatment to that meted out to persons held under 18B, whose treatment for some time was little different from ordinary criminals, and, in fact, worse than any remand prisoner.

These I.R.A. outrages were so fatuous in themselves and so apparently meaningless, at a time when there were no sharp differences between this country and the Irish Free State, that I commenced making a number of inquiries. I was not surprised to discover at length, that special members of the I.R.A. had been enrolled for the committing of these outrages ; and that they were practically all Communists. I had it on excellent authority that the Left Book Club of Dublin had been actively concerned in the matter ; and finally the names of 22 of these men were put into my hands ; and again I was informed on excellent authority that they were all Communists. Immediately on receipt of this information I put down a question to the Home Secretary, and offered to supply the necessary information if the matter were taken up. Nothing came of my representations. From these Communist-inspired outrages, however, there resulted Regulation 18B. Though the I.R.A. were pleaded as an excuse to the House for a Regulation, hardly any of their members were ever arrested under it ; but in due course it [80] was employed to arrest and hold for 4 or 5 years, uncharged, very many hundreds of British subjects, whose one common denominator was that they opposed the Jewish power over this country in general ; and its exertion to thrust her into a war in purely Jewish interests in particular.

Now Communism is Jewish-controlled. If Marxist Jewry needed a device for securing the assent of parliament to a regulation like 18B, what simpler method could there be to achieve this object, without arousing suspicion as to the real ulterior motive, than arranging for a few communist members of the I.R.A. to plant bombs in the cloakrooms of London stations ?

Everyone is supposed to be entitled to their opinion in this country ; and, furthermore, where we cannot supply absolute proof, we can say with the Home Secretary, as I do here, that I have "reasonable cause to believe" that this is the real story behind Regulation 18B's enactment.

When the Clause was first introduced into the House, the original wording laid it down quite clearly that the Home Secretary should have the power to detain persons of British birth and origin "If he was satisfied that" such detention was necessary. This terminology was, at least, crystal clear. No other opinion or check upon the Home Secretary's personal and absolute discretion was envisaged: a return, in fact and in very essence, to the Lettres de Cachet and the Star Chamber.

The House of Commons refused absolutely to accept such a clause, or hand away its powers of supervision, and its responsibilities as the guardian of the rights and liberties of the citizen to any individual, be he Cabinet Minister or not.

The Government accordingly had to withdraw the offending sentence ; and brought forward a second draft for approval some days later. In this new draft, drawn up, as Government spokesmen laboured to explain, in accordance [81] with the express wishes of the House, the necessary safeguard from arbitrary executive tyranny had been introduced.

For the words "Home Secretary is satisfied that," had been substituted, "Has reasonable cause to believe that." The Government spokesmen explained at length on this occasion that this wording gave the required safeguard. Members of Parliament were led to believe that their wishes had prevailed, and that they were to be the judges of what would or would not be "Reasonable Cause" for continued detention (as was proved in subsequent debates), and a rather uneasy House passed the Clause in this form, and on that understanding.

Two years later, when the Counsel of an 18B prisoner argued in Court along these lines, and demanded some sort of ventilation of his client's case before Members of Parliament or a Court, no less a person than the Attorney-General himself pleaded on the Government's behalf, that the words "Has reasonable cause to believe that," meant precisely the same as "Is satisfied that." There the matter had to rest as far as the Law Courts were concerned, though it was the subject of the most scathing comment of a most eminent Law Lord.

I myself was arrested under this Regulation on 23rd May, 1940, and thrown into Brixton Prison, where I remained in a cell until 26th September, 1944, without any charge being preferred against me, receiving merely a curt notification from the Home Office on the latter date that the order for my detention had been "revoked." A paper of "Particulars" alleged as the reasons for my detention was supplied to me soon after my arrest.

I replied to them during a day's interrogation by the so-called Advisory Committee, before which body I could call no witnesses, did not know who were my accusers, or the accusations they had made, and was not allowed the assistance of a lawyer. These particulars, together with my [82] detailed reply to each, were set out in part II of a Statement I supplied later to the Speaker and Members of the House of Commons ; and will be found in the Appendix of this book. They were based upon the untrue assertion that my anti-Communist attitude was bogus, and a cloak for disloyal activities. How untrue this slander was can be easily proved from my previous ten years' record of unceasing attacks on Communism, both by questions and speeches in the House of Commons and outside.

[83]

## 12

### WHO DARES?

On the morning following my release from Brixton Prison, I proceeded to the House of Commons at my usual hour of 10.15 a.m. ; an action which appeared to cause no little surprise. It was not long before Jews and their friends were on my trail, and that of the Right Club. A string of provocative questions soon appeared on the Order Paper ; but, like Gallio who, when the Jews took Sosthenes, and beat him before the Judgement seat, "cared for none of these things," I gave no sign of interest.

The reporters in the Press Galleries were then turned on, to endeavour to extract from me some, at least, of the names in 'the Red Book' of the Right Club membership.

Now the names in the Red Book of members of the Right Club were, as the newspapers have shrieked aloud, kept strictly private, with the sole object of preventing the names becoming known to the Jews. The sole reason for this privacy was the expressed wish of the members themselves. To me, personally, the keeping of the names secret was only a disadvantage. It facilitated misrepresentation of every kind by my enemies ; the publication of the names would have been of great assistance to me in every way. The sole reason for this stipulation on joining by so many members was the well-grounded fear of Jewish retaliation of a serious nature.

I remember in particular the conversation on this subject with one of these reporters from the Press Gallery of the House of Commons. He was an engaging young man, and particularly importunate. Would I not let him have just a [84] few of the names?

"Supposing," I said to him, "your name had been amongst those in the Red Book ; and supposing that in disregard of my promise to you not to reveal it, I proceeded to communicate it to the press ; and supply that definite evidence that you were a member of a society to fight against Jewish domination over Britain: you would not keep your job with your paper for six months."

"I shouldn't keep it for six minutes," was the prompt reply.

"Exactly," I answered. "Now you can see why I can't give you the name of even one member of the Right Club from the Red Book." You yourself confirm their worst fears."

Many hundreds of poor fellows find themselves in such a position today ; indeed, hundreds is merely a matter of expression. The real number must be prodigious. How many, one might ask, can afford to run the risk to their livelihood, which is involved in letting it be known that they are aware of the Jewish grip and prepared to oppose it.

Even the wealthiest and most influential magnates of the land dare not brave the wrath of organised Jewry as the story regarding the *Daily Mail* controlling shares on pp. 6 and 7 of my statement to the Speaker shows. (See Appendix I.)

Not only in Britain has this been the case, but perhaps even more noticeably in the U.S.A., as the diaries of the late Mr James Forrestal prove.

The *Forrestal Diaries* published by the Viking Press, New York, 1951, only reach me as this book goes to press. Coming from a man of high integrity, who was U.S. Navy Under Secretary from 1940, and Secretary for Defence from 1947 until his resignation and suspicious death a few days later in March 1949, they are of the utmost significance.

The most important revelation therein is dated the 27th [85] December, 1945 (pages 121 and 122) :

"Played golf today with Joe Kennedy (Joseph P. Kennedy, who was Roosevelt's Ambassador to Great Britain in the years immediately before the war). I asked him about his conversations with Roosevelt and Neville

Chamberlain from 1938 on. He said Chamberlain's position in 1938 was that England had nothing with which to fight and that she could not risk going to war with Hitler. Kennedy's view : That Hitler would have fought Russia without any later conflict with England if it had not been for Bullitt's (William C. Bullitt, then Ambassador to France) <sup>(9)</sup> urging on Roosevelt in the summer of 1939 that the Germans must be faced down about Poland ; neither the French nor the British would have made Poland a cause of war if it had not been for the constant needling from Washington. Bullitt, he said, kept telling Roosevelt that the Germans wouldn't fight, Kennedy that they would, and that they would overrun Europe. *Chamberlain, he said, stated that America and the world Jews had forced England into the war.*" [Author's italics]

If Mr. Forrestal's information regarding the impulses behind the recent war needed any confirmation, they have already had it from the outspoken statements of Mr. Oswald Pirow, former South African Defence Minister, who told the Associated Press on the 14th January, 1952, in Johannesburg that "Chamberlain had told him that he was under great pressure from World Jewry not to accommodate Hitler."

A second most important revelation in the *Forrestal Diaries* concerns Zionism. It is clear from the entries, that by December, 1947, Mr. Forrestal was becoming greatly concerned by the intervention of the Zionists into American politics. He records conversations with Mr. Byrnes and Senator Vandenberg, Governor Dewey and others, in attempts to lift the Palestine question out of party politics. From this time on he would seem to have made continuous efforts with that end in view.

The *Diary* records on the 3rd Feb., 1948 (pages 362 and 363) [86] :

"Visit today from Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., who came in with strong advocacy of a Jewish State in Palestine, that we should support the United Nations 'decision', I pointed out that the United Nations had as yet taken no 'decision', that it was only a recommendation of the General Assembly and that I thought the methods that had been used by people outside of the Executive branch of the Government to bring coercion and duress on other nations in the General Assembly bordered closely onto scandal ... I said I was merely directing my efforts to lifting the question out of politics, that is, to have the two parties agree that they would not compete for votes on this issue. He said this was impossible, that the nation was too far committed and that, furthermore, the Democratic Party would be bound to lose and the Republicans gain by such an agreement. I said I was forced to repeat to him what I had said to Senator McGrath in response to the latter's observation that our failure to go along with the Zionists might lose the states of New York, Pennsylvania and California —

---

<sup>9</sup> A half-Jew.

that I thought it was about time that somebody should pay some consideration to whether we might not lose the United States."

After a short note by the Editor of the *Diaries* the entry for the 3rd Feb., 1948, continues (page 364) :

"Had lunch with Mr. B. M. Baruch. After lunch raised the same question with him. He took the line of advising me not to be active in this particular matter, and that I was already identified, to a degree that was not in my own interest, with opposition to the United Nations policy on Palestine."

It was about this time that a campaign of unparalleled slander and calumny was launched in the United States press and periodicals against Mr. Forrestal. So greatly did this appear to have affected him that in March 1949, he resigned from the U.S. Defence Secretaryship ; and on the 22nd of that month was found dead as a result of a fall from a very high window.

[87]

## EPILOGUE

I shall always be grateful to the many Members who made my return to the House very much easier than it might have been, by their immediate greetings and friendly attitude. Many, I fear, whose actions in the Chamber itself and outside were detected or reported to the press representatives, found themselves the victims of a vendetta inside their constituencies and in the Press on that specific account.

When we reflect upon these bloody happenings from the time of King Charles I to our own day, we can at long last find only one cause for satisfaction, if such a word can be in any way appropriate. It is that for the first time we can now trace the underlying influences, which explain these hideous disfigurements in European history.

In the light of present-day knowledge, we can now recognise and understand the true significance of these terrible happenings. Instead of mere disconnected occurrences, we can now discern the merciless working of a satanic plan ; and seeing and understanding, we are in a position to take steps in the future to safeguard all those values, which we love and stand for ; and which that plan clearly seeks to destroy.

We can at last begin to oppose the planners and operators of that plan, knowing about it and their technique, which till now have been known to them alone. In other words, being fore-warned, it is our fault if we are not fore-armed.

Let us not forget such words as those of the Jew Marcus Eli Ravage, who wrote in the *Century Magazine* U.S.A. in January 1928 :

"We have stood back of, not only the last war, but all your wars ; and not only the Russian, but all of [88] your revolutions worthy of mention in your history."

Nor should we forget those of Professor Harold Laski, writing in the *New*



*Statesman and Nation* on 11th January, 1942 :

"For this war is in its essence merely an immense revolution in which the war of 1914, the Russian Revolution, and the counter revolutions on the Continent are earlier phases."

Nor the warning from that eminent Jewish American Attorney, publisher and reporter, Henry Klein, issued only last year :

"*The Protocols* is the plan by which a handful of Jews, who compose the Sanhedrin, aim to rule the world by first destroying Christian civilisation."

"Not only are the *Protocols* genuine, in my opinion, but they have been almost entirely fulfilled."

They have indeed been largely fulfilled ; no small measure of Jewish thanks being due to Mr. Roosevelt and his "ardent lieutenant," the self-styled "architect of the Jewish future."

In the process, however, Britain and her Empire and, worse still, her good name and honour have been brought down to the dust.

As Professor Beard wrote: "The noble principles of the Four Freedoms and the Atlantic Charter were for practical purposes discarded in the settlements which accompanied the progress and followed the conclusion of the war. In the validity of this statement the treatment of the people of Esthonia, Lithuania, Poland, Roumania, Yugoslavia, China, Indo-China, Indonesia, Italy, Germany and other places of the earth bear witness."

There appeared recently in the press the cry of Mrs. Chiang Kai Shek calling Britain a "moral weakling" (in reference to China). "Britain has bartered the soul of a nation for a few pieces of silver", she is reported as saying ; and further : "One day these pieces of silver will bear [89] interests in British blood, toil, sweat and tears on the battleground of freedom". It might be General Sikorski himself speaking, might it not ?

In the same paper I saw that Mr. Jackson Martindell, president of the American Institute of Management, has declared that "an Englishman's word is no longer his bond". How often have I heard this from Arab sources since 1939 ?

"I hate to say this," Mr. Martindell continued, "but Britain is becoming poor morally as well as economically."

From Poland to Palestine and to China these words are re-echoed, and be it

said, reiterated by the Jew-wise section of this country for many years.

The reason is not far to seek. No man can serve two masters, more especially when the principles and interests of these two masters are as widely divergent as are those of Britain and her Empire, and Jewry and their Empire, the U.S.S.R.

Ever since the fall of Mr. Chamberlain's Government, the interests of the Jewish Empire have been advanced as prodigiously as those of Britain and her Empire have been eclipsed.

Stranger than all this — should any dare to state the truth in plain terms — the only response is an accusation of anti-Semitism.

As Mr. Douglas Reed has clearly shown, the term "anti-Semitism" is meaningless rubbish — and as he suggests it might as well be called "anti-Semolina."

The Arabs are Semites, and no so-called "anti-Semite" is anti-Arab.

It is not even correct to say that he is anti-Jew. On the contrary, he knows better than the uninformed that a fair proportion of Jews are not engaged in this conspiracy. The only correct term for the mis-called "anti-Semitic" is [90] "Jew-wise." It is indeed the only fair and honest term.

The phrase "anti-Semite" is merely a propaganda word used to stampede the unthinking public into dismissing the whole subject from their minds without examination : so long as that is tolerated these evils will not only continue, but grow worse.

The "Jew-wise" know that we have in Britain a Jewish *Imperium in Imperio*, which, in spite of all protestations and camouflage, is Jewish first and foremost, and in complete unison with the remainder of World Jewry. If any doubt this they need only read *Unity in Dispersion*, issued in 1948 by the World Jewish Congress, which proclaims Jewry to be one nation.

Not all Jews here wish to be railroaded into this narrow social tyranny ; but unless this country affords them some way of escape they dare not take the risks — very grave risks — of defying it : and so they perforce co-operate to some degree.

Even worse, certain Gentiles with no good excuse support this united force, which is in turn used to influence or control our political parties, home and

foreign policies, press and public life.

This unholy united front must be exposed and frustrated. One step towards this objective would seem to be firstly an enactment to prevent Gentile Esaus from lending their hands for the carrying out of orders uttered by the voice of Jewish Jacobs.

Another, the detachment from the Jewish United Front of Jews, who do not wish to subscribe to the dictates of the World Jewish Congress.

First and foremost however is the need to inform people of good will as to the truth of this matter, particularly in regard to the real anatomy, aims, and methods of the Marxist enemy.

It is to that end, that I humbly offer the contents of this book to all, who are determined to fight Communism.

## **STATEMENT**

**Statement by Capt. Ramsey from Brixton  
Prison to the Speaker and Members of  
Parliament concerning his detention under  
Paragraph 18B of the Defence Regulations.**

[93]

**Statement by Capt. Ramsey from Brixton  
Prison to the Speaker and Members of  
Parliament concerning his detention under  
Paragraph 18B of the Defence Regulations.**

All the particulars alleged as grounds for my detention are based on charges that my attitude and activities in opposition to Communism, Bolshevism, and the policy of organised Jewry were not genuine, but merely a camouflage for anti-British designs.

In the following memorandum, which could be greatly expanded, I have given a minimum of facts, which prove that not only was my attitude genuine, open, and unvarying during the whole of my time in the House of Commons, but that in the course of my researches I had accumulated numerous and conclusive facts compelling such an attitude, and leading logically to the formation of the Right Club, an essentially patriotic organisation.

During the whole of my time as M.P. (since 1931) I have kept up an open and unremitting attack on Bolshevism and its allies. Indeed, I had already started this opposition long before I became an M.P.

The following survey will show this ; and also the eventual formation of the Right Club as the logical outcome of my work.

This work falls into three phases.

During the first, dating from soon after the Russian Revolution till about 1935, I supposed the powers behind Bolshevism to be Russian: In the second (1935-38) I appreciated that they were International: By the third phase, I realised them to be Jewish.

**PHASE I.**

It was always a mystery to me in Phase I why Russians spent so much time and money on revolutionary activities in Britain.

My first active step was to speak in the election made famous by the publication in the *Daily Mail* of the letter written by Zinoviev alias Apfelbaum, calling for revolution in Britain. (I spoke against Bolshevism, and in the Northwich division.)

On being elected in 1931, I joined the Russian Trade Committee, which kept a watch on their activities here. I also joined the Council of the Christian Protest Movement, founded to protest against the outrages on priests, nuns, and the Christian churches committed by the Bolsheviks. *Hansard* will show that I asked many questions during this period, attacking their activities in this country.

[94]

## PHASE II.

In Phase II, I recognised the forces behind Bolshevism not to be Russian, but international.

I tried to picture the composition of that mysterious body, the Comintern, over whom, according to the replies to my Parliamentary questions, the Soviet Government could exercise no control.

In the latter end of this phase I had made sufficient progress with this mental picture of the Comintern, that I made it the subject of a number of addresses, which I gave to Rotary Clubs and other societies in London, Edinburgh, and elsewhere, entitling them frequently, *Red Wings Over Europe*.

This second phase lasted well into the Spanish Civil War. Recognising almost at once the guilt of the Comintern in the whole affair, down to the International Brigade, I attacked them continuously by a stream of questions in the House.

The attitude of the entire British national Press at first amazed, and subsequently helped to enlighten me, as to the real powers behind World Revolution. The press presented General Franco's enemies as liberal and Protestant reformers, instead of the anti-God international revolutionaries they were.

Officials of the Russian Cheka were actually in charge of the prisons on the Red side. McGovern established all the main facts in his pamphlet, *Red Terror in Spain*.

I organised parades of sandwich-men at this time to expose the Bolshevik guilt in Spain, assisted a paper called *The Free Press*, and did what propaganda I could. Some eighty or ninety M.P.s subscribed at one time or another to these efforts.

**In September 1937** I accepted the Chairmanship of the United Christian Front Committee, on behalf of Sir Henry Lunn. Thereafter many thousands of letters were sent out over my signature to leading people in the Kingdom, appraising them of the true facts of the war in Spain, and urging Christians of all communities to join in combating the Godless Red Terror, that threatened Spain then, and thereafter all Europe, Britain included.

A number of patriotic societies now began to co-operate regularly with me in this work against Bolshevism, including the National Citizens' Union, the British Empire League, the Liberty Restoration League, and the Economic League. We took to meeting regularly in a Committee Room of the House of Commons.

**In May 1936**, when I set out to oppose the entry into this country of agents of the Comintern for attending the so-called Godless Congress, [95] we were joined by the British Bible Union, the Order of the Child, and the British Israel World Federation. From information given me by these societies, I realized that the previous Godless Congress, held at Prague, had brought under unified control all the National Free-Thinker societies, who were now under the authority of the Militant Godless of Russia, and were therefore a subtle and potent weapon for Bolshevik propaganda.

At our meetings to co-ordinate opposition, we all agreed that while it was perhaps the right of British men and women to hold a Congress on any subject, this liberty should not be construed into licence for international revolutionaries to develop their plans for the destruction of the religious, social and public life of our country.

**On the 28th June**, therefore, I introduced a Bill entitled the ALIENS' RESTRICTION (BLASPHEMY) BILL, to prevent aliens from attending this Congress, or making it the occasion for the distribution of their blasphemous literature.

The Bill received a first reading by 165 votes to 134. In the No Lobby were Messrs. Rothschild, G.R. Strauss, T. Levy, A.M. Lyons, Sir F. Harris, D.N. Pritt, W. Gallacher, Dr. Haden Guest and Dr. Summerskill.

**In the autumn of 1938** I was made acquainted with the fact that the power behind World Revolution was not just a vague body of internationalists, but organized World Jewry. The first document so convincing me was actually a British Government White Paper, of whose existence I had not been previously aware. This quoted verbatim an extract from a report received by Mr. Balfour on September 19th, 1918, from Mr. Oudendyke, the Netherlands Minister in

Petrograd, who was at that time in charge of British interests there, as follows :

"The danger is now so great, that I feel it my duty to call the attention of the British Government and all other Governments to the fact that if an end is not put to Bolshevism at once the civilization of the whole world will be threatened. This is not an exaggeration, but a matter of fact ... I consider that the immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue before the world, not even excluding the war which is still raging, and unless as above stated Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately it is bound to spread over Europe and the whole world in one form or another, as it is organized and worked by Jews, who have no nationality and whose one object it is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things. The only manner [96] in which this danger can be averted would be collective action on the part of all the Powers."

Almost as remarkable as the above quotation was the fact brought to my notice simultaneously, namely, that this *White Paper* had been immediately withdrawn, and replaced by an abridged edition, from which these vital passages had been eliminated. I was shown the two White papers — the original and the abridged issue, side by side. The second document which came to my notice at this time was the booklet entitled, *The Rulers of Russia*, written by Dr. Dennis Fahey, C.S.S.P., and bearing the imprimatur of the Archbishop of Dublin, dated the 26th March, 1938. In the opening sentence of this pamphlet Dr Fahey writes :

"In this pamphlet I present to my readers a number of serious documents which go to show that the real forces behind Bolshevism are Jewish forces ; and that Bolshevism is really an instrument in the hands of the Jews for the establishment of their future Messianic kingdom."

Dr. Fahey then adduces an interesting volume of evidence. On page 1 he gives also the following passage by Mr. Hilaire Belloc, taken from the latter's *Weekly*, dated 4th February, 1937 :

"As for anyone who does not know that the present revolutionary Bolshevik movement in Russia is Jewish, I can only say that he must be a man who is taken in by the suppression of our deplorable Press."

Other authorities quoted in the pamphlet include Dr. Homer, D. Sc., Count Leon de Poncins in his *Contre-Revolution*, and evidence given on 12th February, 1919, before a Committee of the United States Senate by the Rev. George A. Simons, Superintendent of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Petrograd from 1907 to October 6th 1918.

The Rev. Mr. Simons stated on this occasion with regard to the Bolshevik



## Government in Petrograd :

"In December 1918 ... under the Presidency of a man known as Apfelbaum (Zinoviev) ... out of 388 members, only 16 happened to be real Russians, and all the rest (with the exception of one man, who is a Negro from North America) were Jews ... and 265 of these Jews belonging to this Northern Commune Government that is sitting in the old Smolny Institute come from the Lower East Side of New York — 265 of them."

On page 8 Dr Fahey quotes figures showing that in the year 1936 :

[97] "The Central Committee of the Communist Party in Moscow, the very centre of International Communism, consisted of 59 members, of whom 56 were Jews, and the other three were married to Jewesses ... "

"Stalin, present ruler of Russia, is not a Jew, but he took as his second wife the twenty-one year old sister of the Jew L.M. Kaganovitch, his right-hand man, who has been spoken of as his probable or possible successor. Stalin's every movement is made under Jewish eyes."

In addition to these documents there now reached me a quantity of evidence concerning Jewish activities in Great Britain in the shape of subversive organizations of every description, anti-religious, anti-moral, revolutionary, and those working to establish the Jewish system of financial and industrial monopoly.

Thus I became finally convinced of the fact that the Russian and Spanish revolutions, and the subversive societies in Britain, were part and parcel of the one and the same Plan, secretly operated and controlled by World Jewry, exactly on the lines laid down in the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, filed in the British Museum in 1906 (which had been reproduced soon after the last war by *The Morning Post*, and from which this newspaper never recovered). These *Protocols* are no forgery, and I and others could supply evidence to that effect that would convince any impartial Tribunal.

At the next meeting of the patriotic and Christian societies, I felt in duty bound to broach the Jewish question ; and realized, very soon, that there had come a parting of the ways. With very few exceptions our co-operation ceased. I realized that if anything was to be done, some special group would have to be formed which, while retaining the essential characteristics of the former one, would take up the task of opposing and exposing the Jewish menace. It was then that the idea of the Right Club originated, though the actual formation did not actually come about till some months later, in May 1939.

From the autumn of 1938 onwards, I spent many hours a week talking to back-benchers and members of the Government alike on these subjects.

The very magnitude of the issues involved put many off. One particular rejoinder typifies in my recollection this sort of attitude : [98]

"Well, that is all very disturbing, awful, in fact: but what is one to do about it ? I shall go off now and try and forget all about it as soon as possible."

**About the end of 1938**, news was brought to me that the control shares of the *Daily Mail* were for sale.

Knowing that a severe advertisement boycott had been put in operation against the paper following upon its having printed two or three articles giving what in Internationalist eyes had been a pro-Franco view of the Spanish War (in reality, the truth), the news was no great surprise to me.

Could I find a buyer ? I decided to approach a certain very wealthy and patriotic peer, the head of a great business. A mutual friend arranged an interview.

On introduction I gave a survey of the activities and power of Organized Jewry in general, and of their secret publicity control in Britain in particular, as I saw it. When I ended after some 70 minutes, general concurrence in my views was expressed. Thereupon the mutual friend and I tried to persuade our hearer to buy the said shares and "tear the gag off the conspiracy of silence." "I daren't," he replied, "they would bring me to a crust of bread. If it was only myself, I wouldn't mind ; I'd fight them. But many of my shares are held by the widow and the orphan, and for their sakes I must refuse."

On our expressing astonishment that Jewry could inflict such crushing retaliation on a man of his financial strength and industrial power, and so conspicuous a national figure, he gave us details of just such retaliation directed against him by Organized Jewry some years previously. He had refused to comply with some demands they had made of him affecting his works. After a final warning, which he ignored, a world boycott had been started against him, which had become effective in 24 hours, wherever he had agents or offices. Fires and strikes also mysteriously occurred. The resulting losses had finally compelled him to give in.

Within 24 hours the boycott was lifted all over the world.

The consistent mis-reporting of important features in the Spanish Civil War

had deeply impressed many M.P.s. They felt that a bias so extreme, so universal, and so consistent, always against Franco, indicated the existence of some deliberate plan, and though unwilling to agree my thesis, that the Jews were operating this control by [99] various means, and that the whole affair was part of their World Plan, nevertheless many felt that something was very wrong somewhere.

In the course of these conversations I obtained the support of Members of all parties to the Bill I was preparing in this connection.

**On December 13th, 1938,** I introduced the Bill entitled COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL, which made it compulsory for shares in Newspapers and News Agencies to be held in the actual names of the holders, instead of the names of nominees as is done now in the majority of cases.

The Bill received a First Reading by 151 votes to 104. In the Aye Lobby were Members of all parties, including 13 Right Hon. Gentlemen (8 of these Socialists).

In the No Lobby were messrs. Rothschild, Schuster, Shinwell, Cazalet, Gallacher, Sir A. Sinclair, Gluckstein, and Mr. Samuel Storey opposed, also blocked the Bill ; and seemed suitable for that role.

I now took the decision to proceed at once with the formation of a group similar in character to the group of representatives of Christian and patriotic societies, which I had worked with up to the emergence of the Jewish problem ; but this time a group which would place opposition to that menace in the forefront of its activities.

The group was finally inaugurated in May 1939, and was the Right Club. Simultaneously, a Committee was formed with the dual purpose of co-ordinating the work of all the Patriotic Societies referred to on pp.— and of being a recruiting ground for the Right Club. This group was called the Co-ordinating Committee.

Mr. Cross was the Secretary, and the late Duke of Wellington, President of the Liberty Restoration League, was the Chairman at most of the few meetings we held. The first object of the Right Club was to enlighten the Tory Party and clear it from any Jewish control.

Organized Jewry was now clearly out for World War. The failure of their International Brigade in Spain, and the growing exposure of themselves, and the consequent risk of total collapse of their plans rendered immediate war from their point of view imperative.

In **July 1939** I had an interview with the Prime Minister. I dealt with the Russian Revolution, and the part Jewry had played in it ; and with the Spanish Revolution, prepared and carried out on similar lines by much the same people ; with the subversive societies in Britain, and the Press and news control existing in this country. I [100] finally drew the Prime Minister's attention to the underground work that was going on with object of overthrowing his peace policy and himself, and precipitating the war. Mr. Chamberlain considered that charges of so grave and far reaching a character would require very substantial documentary proof. I decided to collect documentary proof which would make it possible for action to be taken.

The outbreak of war enabled the Jews to give their activities the cloak of patriotism. Their press power enabled them to portray those opposing their designs and exposing them as pro-Nazi, and disloyal to Britain. The difficulty I was faced with was that while I was in duty bound to warn the country against the consequences of a policy influenced by Organized Jewry and opposed to British interests, I, at the same time, did not want to create difficulties for Mr. Chamberlain.

It was decided, therefore, that the Right Club should close down for the duration. The spirit of the Club naturally led the younger members to join the Services, wherein they have served with distinction on most fronts. It was in keeping with the same spirit that others, not so engaged, should continue to fight the internal enemy, no less formidable than the Axis Powers and in a way more dangerous, owing to his secret methods and the fact that he can work from within as well as from without.

To this end, therefore, I and others in an individual capacity disseminated on occasion some leaflets of mine called *Do You Know ?* and *Have You Noticed ?* ; my verses beginning "Land of dope and Jewry", and some anti-Jewish stickers. This was with the idea of educating the public sufficiently to maintain the atmosphere in which the "phoney" war, as it was called, might be converted into an honourable peace.

It was certainly not defeatist, as Jewish propaganda tried to make out. It was not we of the Right Club who were holding back from the fighting Services in this war, any more than in the last ; quite the contrary.

I was determined to make further efforts to convince Mr. Chamberlain, and even perhaps the 1922 Committee, of the truth of my case, and thus avert total war, and commenced reinforcing the documentary evidence already in my possession.

**By January 1940**, I had details of nearly thirty subversive societies working on various revolutionary and corrosive lines, and had completed [101] a very large chart, showing the principal members of each.

Six names stood out clearly, as a sort of interlocking directorate. They were Prof. H. Laski, Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, Prof. Herman Levy, Mr. Victor Gollancz, Mr. D.N. Pritt, M.P., and Mr. G.R. Strauss, M.P.

In February 1940, on my arrival in London, I was handed the literature of a new group, who were advocating FEDERAL UNION. The list of supporters' names was startling. It might have been copied from the chart I had just completed. There could be no mistake as to the source of this scheme. Later, when this group became active, I put down the following questions :

**Captain Ramsay** asked the Prime Minister whether he could assure the House that the creation of a Federal Union of the European States is not one of the war aims of H.M.'s Government.

**Mr. Butler** (on May 9th) gave a non-committal reply. To this I asked the following supplementary :

**Captain Ramsay** : Is my Right Hon. Friend aware that this plan, if adopted, will arouse hostility against us in almost the whole of Europe, who look upon it as the setting up of a Judæo-Masonic super-State ?

[*Note.*— The *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* make it clear the World Jewry and Orient Masonry will set up just such a regime after the Gentile States have been reduced by War and Revolutions to hewers of wood and drawers of water.)

**Mr. Butler** : I would rather leave my Hon. Friend's interpretation of this plan to him.

A virulent press campaign was now in full swing to suppress "Anti-Semitic" views and activities by declaring that "Anti-Semitism" was pro-Nazi. Fearing lest the Home Secretary might be inclined into this direction, which was a false direction, I asked him on May 9th, 1940 :

**Captain Ramsay** : Whether he will give an assurance that care will be taken both in the administration of the present regulations, and in framing revised ones, that a distinction is made between anti-semitism and pro-Nazism ?

**Sir J. Anderson** : I hope that any restrictive measures applied to organized propaganda may in practice be confined to such propaganda as is calculated to impede the war effort ; and from that point of view I cannot recognise as relevant

the distinction which My Hon. and Gallant Friend seeks to draw. [102]

**Captain Ramsay** : While thanking by Right Hon. Friend for his reply, in view of the fact that he seems somewhat confused on this point, will he assure the House that he refuses to be stampeded into indentifying the two things by a ramp in our Jewridden Press ?

**Sir J. Anderson** : There is no question of my being stampeded into anything.

It was in the last weeks of Mr. Chamberlain's Premiership that I was enabled to look through some of the U.S. Embassy papers at Mr. Kent's flat.

This then was the position, and these were the considerations which led me to inspect them.

1. Together with many members of both Houses of Parliament, I was fully aware that among the agencies here and abroad, which had been actively engaged in promoting bad feeling between Great Britain and Germany, Organized Jewry, for obvious reasons, had played a leading part.

2. I knew the U.S.A. to be the headquarters of Jewry, and therefore the real, though not apparent, centre of their activity.

3. I was aware that Federal union was the complement in international affairs of the scheme of Political and Economic Planning (P.E.P.). The Chairman of P.E.P. is Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, who is also Vice-Chairman of the Zionist Federation and Grand Commander of the Order of Maccabeans, designed to bring about Bolshevism by stealth in the sphere of industry and commerce, and that it must be regarded as the Super-State, which is one of the principal objectives of International Jewry.

4. I recognized that plans for establishing Marxist Socialism under Jewish control in this country were far advanced. As to their intentions, there could be no doubt.

5. I knew that the technique of International Jewry is always to plan the overthrow at critical junctures of any national leader who seriously opposes some essential part of their designs, as for instance Mr. Chamberlain had done by adhering to his policy of pacification, and that in this case Mr. Chamberlain's fall would precipitate total war.

6. I remembered that Mr. Lloyd George had said in the House of

Commons, that if we were let in for a war over Poland without the help of Russia, we should be walking into a trap. We walked into that trap.

[103] Further information as to its origin, design, and ultimate objective, would have strengthened Mr. Chamberlain's hand, and would have enabled him to take the appropriate counter-measures.

As a Member of Parliament, still loyal to Mr. Chamberlain, considered it my duty to investigate.

About the 9th or 10th of May I went to Scotland for a fortnight's rest, having seen only a part of the documents, and intending to resume my investigations on my return.

Before I could conclude them, however, Mr. Chamberlain had fallen from office, and I was arrested a few days later on the steps of my house, when I returned to London on the 23rd May, 1940.

I am appending the Particulars, alleged as Reasons for my detention, and my comments thereon.

(Signed) ARCHIBALD RAMSAY

Brixton Prison, August 23rd, 1943.

### **PARTICULARS ALLEGED AS REASONS FOR MY DETENTION.**

There follows here a copy of the Particulars, which were alleged to be reasonable grounds for my detention for the last three years.

It will be seen that the whole basis of every one of them is, that my opposition to Communism, Bolshevism and World Jewry was but a sham ; a disloyal ruse, in fact, adopted. to mask anti-British activities in relation to the war.

Anyone conversant with doings in the House of Commons will be more or less familiar with the anti-Bolshevik activities that I have kept up openly and consistently all through my time in the House since 1931 ; and which activities



became anti-Jewish in 1938, when I realized that Bolshevism was Jewish and an integral part of their World Plan.

The framer of these Particulars brushes aside the whole of that eight years' record, and proceeds to fabricate and reiterate some new and disloyal purpose, for which slanders he offers no shred of substantiation.

[104]

Home Office.  
Advisory Committee  
(Defence Regulation 18B)  
London, W. 1.

Telephone : REGent 4784

Ref.: RA

24th June, 1940.

**REASONS FOR ORDER MADE UNDER DEFENCE  
REGULATION 18B IN THE CASE OF CAPTAIN  
ARCHIBALD MAULE RAMSAY, M.P.**

The Order under Defence Regulation 18B was made against Captain Archibald Maule Ramsay, M.P., because the Secretary of State had reasonable cause to believe that the said Captain Archibald Maule RAMSAY, M.P., had been recently concerned in acts prejudicial to the public safety or the defence of the Realm, or in the preparation or instigation of such acts, and that by reason thereof it was necessary to exercise control over him.

**PARTICULARS**

The said Captain Archibald Maule RAMSAY, M.P.

- (i) In or about the month of May 1939, formed an Organisation under the name of the "Right Club," which ostensibly directed its activities against Jews, Freemasons and Communists. This Organisation, in reality, was designed secretly to spread subversive and defeatist views among the civil population of Great Britain, to obstruct the war effort of Great Britain, and thus to endanger public safety and the defence of the Realm.



- (ii) In furtherance of the real objects of the Organisation, the said RAMSAY allowed the names of the members of the Organisation to be known only to himself, and took great precautions to see that the register of members did not leave his possession or control ; and stated that he had taken steps to mislead the Police and the Intelligence Branch of the War Office as to the real activities of the Organisation. These steps were taken to prevent the real purposes of the Organisation being known.
- (iii) Frequently expressed sympathy with the policy and aims of the German Government ; and at times expressed his desire to co-operate with the German Government in the conquest and subsequent government of Great Britain.
- (iv) After the formation of the Organisation, made efforts, on behalf of the Organisation, to introduce members of the Organisation into the Foreign Office, the Censorship, the Intelligence Branch of the War Office, and Government departments, in order to further the real objects of the Organisation as set out in (i) hereof.

[105]

- (v) After the outbreak of war, associated with and made use of persons known to him to be active in opposition to the interests of Great Britain. Among such persons were one, Anna Wolkoff, and one, Tyler Kent, a Coding Officer employed at the Embassy of the United States of America. With knowledge of the activities in which Wolkoff and Kent were engaged, he continued to associate with them and to make use of their activities on behalf of the "Right Club" and of himself. In particular, with knowledge that Kent had abstracted important documents, the property of the Embassy of the United States of America, he visited Kent's flat at 47, Gloucester Place, where many of the said documents were kept, and inspected them for his own purposes. He further deposited with the said Kent the secret register of the members of the "Right Club," of which Organisation Kent had become an important member, in order to try and keep the nature of the Organisation secret.
- (vi) Permitted and authorized his wife to act on his behalf in associating with, and making use of, persons known to him to be active in opposing the interests of Great Britain. Among these persons were Anna Wolkoff, Tyler Kent, and Mrs. Christabel Nicholson.

## PARTICULAR (i)

In or about the month of May 1939 formed an Organization called the "Right Club," which ostensibly directed its activities against Jews, Freemasons, and Communists. This Organization was secretly designed to spread subversive and defeatist views among the civil population of Great Britain, to obstruct the war effort of Great Britain, and thus to endanger public safety and the defence of the Realm.

*Reply.*

The formation of the Right Club, as the attached memorandum shows, was the logical outcome of many years of work against bolshevism, carried on both inside and outside the House of Commons, and well-known to all my political colleagues since 1931.

The main object of the Right Club was to oppose and expose the activities of Organized Jewry, in the light of the evidence which came into my possession in 1938, some of which is given in the memorandum.

Our first objective was to clear the Conservative Party of Jewish influence, and the character of our membership and meetings were strictly in keeping with this objective. There were no other and secret purposes. [106]

Our hope was to avert war, which we considered to be mainly the work of Jewish intrigue centred in New York. Later, I and many others hoped to turn the "phoney" war into, not total war, but an honourable negotiated peace.

It is difficult to imagine a body of persons less capable of being "subversive" as this Particular suggests, and coupling this charge with the charge of being "defeatist" places this whole Particular in the realm of the ludicrous.

## PARTICULAR (ii).

"In furtherance of the real objects of the Organization the said RAMSAY allowed the names of the members of the Organization to be known only to himself, and took great precautions that the register of members did not leave his possession or control ; and stated that he had taken steps to mislead the Police and the Intelligence Branch of the War Office as to the real activities of the Organization. These steps were taken to prevent the real purpose of the Organization being known."

*Reply.*

The real objects of the Right Club being the declared objects, and there being no other objects whatever, the latter part of this Particular is pure fabrication.

There was only one respect in which our aims differed from the Police and M.I., namely, the Jewish question.

Neither Police nor M.I. recognised the Jewish menace. Neither had any machinery for dealing with it, or for withholding information from Jewish members of their personnel.

If names of members of the Club had been placed at the disposal of either of these departments, they would have been seized upon by the Jewish members therein, and reported on to the very quarters from which many members wished them to be withheld.

PARTICULAR (iii).

"Frequently expressed sympathy with the policy and aims of the German Government ; and at times expressed his desire to co-operate with the German Government in the conquest and subsequent government of Great Britain."

*Reply.*

The latter half of this Particular is a fabrication so preposterous that I propose to treat it with the contempt it deserves.

[107]

Lord Marley embroidered this fiction in the Lords a few days after my arrest, insinuating that I had undertaken to be Gauleiter of Scotland.

My solicitors at once invited him to repeat his remarks outside. Needless to say, he did not do to, for there is not a shred of justification for either this Particular or his slanders.

The term "sympathy with the policy and aims of the German Government" is misleading to the verge of dishonesty. It suggests some general agreement or understanding.

Nothing of the kind existed.

I have never been to Germany, and beyond one formal luncheon at their Embassy knew no Germans. What little I had learned about the Nazi system did not appeal to me.

I have never approved of the idea of movements on distantly similar lines being formed in Britain. On the contrary, I disapproved.

My view was that the Unionist Party, once enlightened, was the body best suited to take the needful counter-measures to the Jewish plan, and that to do so successfully it did not even need to go outside the powers latent in our Constitution.

In a general way my views concerning German aspirations coincided exactly with those expressed by Lord Lothian in his speech at Chatham House on 29th June, 1937, when he said :

"Now if the principle of self-determination were applied on behalf of Germany in the way in which it was applied against her, it would mean the re-entry of Austria into Germany, the union of the Sudeten-Deutsch, Danzig and possibly Memel with Germany, and certain adjustments with Poland in Silesia and the Corridor."

The only aspect of the Nazi policy which contacted in any special way with my views was the opposition to the disruptive activities of Organized World Jewry. No patriot-British, French, German or of any other nationality is justified in abandoning the defence of his country to that onslaught, once he has recognized its reality.

To confuse sympathy on this one and loyal point with sympathy with the whole Nazi policy and aims is dishonest; to develop this fallacy into a charge of preferring that system to our own, and being prepared to force that system (of which I disapproved) upon my own country, is the last word in infamy.

[108]

PARTICULAR (iv).

"After the formation of the Organization, made efforts on behalf of the Organization, to introduce members of the Organization into the Foreign Office, the Censorship, the Intelligence Branch of the War Office, and Government departments, in order to further the real objects of the Organization, as set out in (i) hereof!"

*Reply.*

Again we have here the fabrication of the wholly unjustifiable charge of a secret and disloyal purpose, already dealt with in Particular (i), and my Memorandum.

In regard to the matter of members of the Right Club and Government offices, I would say this:

The objects of the Club being to spread as rapidly as possible the truth concerning the Jewish danger, time was always a vital factor. From the outset we were in a race with the Jewish propagandists.

To counter them in as many different spheres as possible was obviously the quickest method. Ten members in ten different spheres would spread our information more widely, more quickly than ten members all in the same office or club.

Every political group must follow these lines ; this method is the common practice of all political parties.

I never at any time made any effort to get any member a job in any Government Office.

If a member had a choice of two jobs, and didn't mind which he or she took, and asked me about it, I should clearly have replied that as far as the Club was concerned. the sphere in which we had no member to preach the gospel was the one to choose.

For the knowledge to reach such places as the Foreign Office, War Office, etc., was obviously to achieve the enlightenment of influential persons most rapidly of all.

PARTICULAR (v).

"After the outbreak of war. associated with and made use of persons known by him to be active in opposition to the interests of Great Britain. Among such persons were one, Anna Wolkoff. and one, Tyler Kent, a Coding Officer employed at the Embassy of the U.S.A., with the knowledge of the activities in [109] which Wolkoff and Kent were engaged, he continued to associate with them and to make use of their activities on behalf of the "Right Club" and of himself. In particular with knowledge that Kent had abstracted important documents, the property of the Embassy of the U.S.A., he visited Kent's flat at

47, Gloucester Place, where many of the said documents were kept. and inspected them for his own purpose. He further deposited with the said Kent the secret register of the members of the 'Right Club,' of which Organization Kent had become an important member, in order to try and keep the nature of the Organization secret."

*Reply.*

I have never at any time of my life associated with persons whom I have known to be in opposition to the interests of Britain. On the contrary, my whole record proves that I have devoted more time and trouble than most people to fighting just such persons.

I certainly did not know, and do not now know, that either Mr. Kent or Miss Wolkoff were engaged in activities calculated or likely to harm the interests of Britain.

From my own acquaintance with them both, and conversations I have had during that period, I know they both recognized the activities of Organized Jewry to be one of the most evil forces in politics in general, and one of the most dangerous to the interests of Britain in particular.

All their actions will have been directed to countering those Powers and their designs, and most certainly not to anything that might injure the interests of Britain.

As for myself, I should like to add here most emphatically, in view of various mendacious allegations on the subject that have since reached my ears, that I have never, and of course could never contemplate communicating information to enemy quarters.

Having reasonable cause to believe that the Jewish International intrigues to bring about total war radiated from New York, and knowing that activities were being carried on to sabotage Mr. Chamberlain's policy of pacification and to bring about his overthrow, it was my obvious duty as a Member of Parliament, and one still loyal to Mr. Chamberlain, to make any investigation I could.

I deposited the Red Book of names of the Right Club members at Mr. Kent's flat for the period of my absence from London only.

[110] I had heard of several persons who had had their papers (dealing with the same sort of subjects as mine) ransacked by persons unknown in their absence.

As I have stated already, I had given explicit assurance of privacy to some of the persons whose names were entered therein. Had their names even come into the hands of the British Secret Police, personated as this force is by Jews, their attitude vis-a-vis the Jewish menace would have become known at once in the very quarters from which they made a particular point of their being withheld, namely, Jewish quarters.

Political burglary is no new thing in this country, when one is suspected of possessing information relating to the activities of Organized Jewry.

Lord Craigmyle, when Lord of Appeal, had his whole house ransacked, every drawer broken open and every paper searched without anything being stolen, at a time when it was reasonable to suppose that his papers contained such matter.

The Chief Lieutenant of Police in Edinburgh declared at the time that it was a "political burglary"; the perpetrators were never traced.

(See the letter of Lord Craiginyle, dated 6th July, 1920, entitled "Edinburgh and Freedom," published in *Letters to Isabel*.)

PARTICULAR (vi).

"Permitted and authorised his wife to act on his behalf in association with, and making use of, persons known by him to be active in opposition to the interests of Great Britain. Among these were Anna WolkotT, Tyler Kent and Mrs. Christabel Nicholson."

*Reply.*

There is no truth whatever in this Particular and I propose to treat it with the contempt it deserves.

Needless to say, the Home Office Advisory Committee produced no evidence to support any of the slanders contained in any of the above Particulars

## CONCLUSION

I submit this statement, and the comments on the Particulars, not for my own sake, but to enlighten the country.

[111] When things reach a stage wherein a Lord of Appeal, whose papers are suspected of relating to the plans of Organized Jewry. can be "politically burgled."

When a White Paper containing vital passages on Jewish World-Bolshevism can be immediately withdrawn, and reprinted omitting the vital passages.

When a leading British Industrialist can be blackmailed by Organized Jewry, and coerced into submission by boycott, strikes, acts of sabotage and arson.

When a Member of Parliament, who dares to try and warn the country against this menace of Organized Jewry and their help-mates (the only Fifth Column that really exists in this country) is thereupon imprisoned for three years on false charges.

When these things can happen in Britain, then there must surely be something wrong somewhere.

At a time when Britain and the Empire are engaged in a life-and-death struggle. surely there can be no room for the foul teachings and activities which I have touched upon.

While our sailors. soldiers and airmen are winning victories over the external enemies, surely it is the duty of every patriot to fight this internal enemy at home.

The Prime Minister. in his speech at the Mansion House, stated that he had not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.

There are more ways than one of encompassing the liquidation of the British Empire today ; and the National Leader who is determined to counter them all will not only need the utmost support of all patriots. but I believe it will be proved that his most formidable difficulties will emanate from just those very powers which I and other members of the Right Club have all along striven to oppose and expose.



[112]

## APPENDIX 1

*Les Estatutz de la Jeuerie* 1275.

From *The Statues of The Realm*. Vol. 1, page 221.

### THE STATUTES OF JEWRY

#### **Usury forbidden to the Jews.**

Forasmuch as the King hath seen that divers evils and the disinheriting of good men of his land have happened by the usuries which the Jews have made in time past, and that divers sins have followed thereupon albeit that he and his ancestors have received much benefit from the Jewish people in all times past, nevertheless, for the honour of God and the common benefit of the people the King hath ordained and established, that from henceforth no Jew shall lend anything at usury either upon land, or upon rent or upon other thing.

#### **Distress for Jews.**

And that the distress for debts due unto the Jews from henceforth shall not be so grievous but that the moiety of lands and chattels of the Christians shall remain for their maintenance: and that no distress shall be made for a Jewry debt upon the heir of the debtor named in the Jew's deed, nor upon any other person holding the land that was the debtor's before that the debt be put in suit and allowed in court.

#### **Valuing lands taken for a Jew's debt.**

And if the sheriff or other bailiff by the King's command hath to give Saisin (possession) to a Jew be it one or more, for their debt, the chattels shall be valued by the oaths of good men and be [113] delivered to the Jew or Jews or to their proxy to the amount of the debt ; and if the chattels be not sufficient, the lands shall be extended by the same oath before the delivery of Saisin to the Jew or Jews, to each in his due proportion, so that it may be certainly known that the debt is quit, and the Christian may have his land again ; saving always to the Christian the moiety of his land and chattels for his maintenance as aforesaid, and the chief mansion.

### **Warranty to Jews.**

And if any moveable hereafter be found in possession of a Jew, and any man shall sue him the Jew shall be allowed his warranty if he may have it ; and if not let him answer therefore so that he be not therein otherwise privileged than a Christian.

### **Abode of Jews.**

And that all Jews shall dwell in the King's own cities and boroughs where the chests of the chirographs of Jews are wont to be.

### **Their badge.**

And that each Jew after he shall be seven years old, shall wear a badge on his outer garment that is to say in the form of two tables joined of yellow felt of the length of six inches and of the breadth of three inches.

### **Their tax.**

And that each one, after he shall be twelve years old pay three pence yearly at Easter of tax to the King whose bond-man he is ; and this shall hold place as well for a woman as for a man.

### **Conveyance of land, etc., by Jews.**

And that no Jew shall have the power to infeoff (take possession of) another whether Jew or Christian of houses, rents, or tenements, that he now hath, nor to alien in any other manner, nor to make acquittance to any Christian of his debt without the special license of the King, until the King shall have otherwise ordained therein.

### **Privileges of the Jews.**

And forasmuch as it is the will and sufferance of Holy Church that they may live and be preserved, the King taketh them under his protection, and granteth them his peace ; and willeth that they be safely preserved and defended by his sherriffs and other bailiffs and by his liege men, and commandeth that none shall do them harm or damage, or wrong in their bodies or in their goods, moveable or immovable, and they shall neither plead nor be impleaded in any court nor be challenged or troubled in any court except in the court of the King

whose bondmen they are ; and that none shall owe obedience, or service or rent except to the King or his bailiffs in his name unless it be for their dwelling which they now hold by paying rent ; saving the right of Holy Church.

### **Intercourse between Jews and Christians.**

And the King granteth unto them that they may gain their living by lawful merchandise and their labour, and that they may [114] have intercourse with Christians in order to carry on lawful trade by selling and buying. But that no Christian for this cause or any other shall dwell among them. And the King willeth that they shall not by reason of their merchandise be put to lot and soot nor in taxes with the men of the cities and boroughs where they abide ; for that they are taxable to the King as his bondmen and to none other but the King.

### **Holding houses and farms. etc.**

Moreover the King granteth unto them that they may buy houses and castilages in the cities and boroughs where thg abide, so that they hold them in chief of the King ; saving unto the lords of the fee their services due and accustomed. And that they may take and buy farms or land for the term of ten years or less without taking homages or fealties or such sort of obedience from Christians and without having advowsons of churches, and that they may be able to gain their living in the world, if they have not the means of trading or cannot labour; and this licence to take land to farm shall endure to them for fifteen years from this time forward.

### *Note:*

The Parliament which passed this Statute included representatives of the Commons, and this was probably the first Statute in the enactment of which the Commons had any part. It is significant that the first evidence of the feelings and wishes of the commoners should have expressed itself in such a form as in these Statues of Jewry, in face of the fact, clearly evident in the script, that the Kings owed much to Jewish activities having demanded monies from the Jews regularly and permitted them in turn to recoup themselves from the people.

[115]

## APPENDIX 2

### THE JEWS IN BRITAIN

- 1215      Magna Carta
- 1255      Ritual murder of St. Hugh of Lincoln. Henry III personally ordered trial and 18 culprits were executed — all Jews.
- 1275      The Statute of Jewry passed ; confined Jews to certain areas, forbade usury to them and also ownership of land and contact with the people: compelled them to wear a yellow badge.
- 1290      Edward I banished the Jews from England.
- 1657      Oliver Cromwell, having been financed by Manasseh Ben Israel and Moses Carvajal, allows Jews to return to England, though order of banishment never rescinded by Parliament.
- 1689      Amsterdam Jews financed the rebellion against King James II. The chief of these — Solomon Medina — follows William of Orange to England.
- 1694      The Bank of "England" set up and the National Debt instituted, securing for the Jew moneylenders a first charge on the taxes of England for interest on their loans. The right to print money transferred from the Crown to this "Bank of England".
- 1707      Economic and political union forced upon Scotland against the vote of every county and borough ; the national debt foisted upon Scotland, and the royal mint in Edinburgh suppressed.

[116]

## APPENDIX 3

### FAMOUS MEN ON THE JEWS

***Seneca B.C. 4 to A.D. 5***

"The customs of this accursed people have grown so strong, that they have spread through every land".

***St Justin 116 A.D.***

"The Jews were behind all the persecutions of the Christians. They wandered through the country everywhere hating and undermining the Christian faith."

***Mohammed 570***

"It is incomprehensible to me, why one has not long ago expelled these death-breathing beasts ... are these Jews anything else but devourers of men?"

***Martin Luther 1483***

"How the Jews love the book of Esther, which is so suitable to their bloodthirsty, revengeful, murderous appetite and hope. The sun has never shone on such a bloodthirsty and vindictive people, who cherish the idea of murdering and strangling the heathen. No other men under the sun are more greedy than they have been, and always will be, as one can see from their accursed usury. They console themselves that when their Messiah comes he will collect all the gold and silver in the world and divide it among them."

***Clement VIII Pope 1592***

"All the world suffers from the usury of the Jews, their monopolies and deceit. They have brought many unfortunate peoples into a state of poverty, especially farmers, working-class people, and the very poor."

***Voltaire 1694***

"The Jews are nothing but an ignorant and barbaric people, which have for a long time combined the most loathsome avarice with the most abominable superstition and inextinguishable hatred of all peoples by whom they are

tolerated, and through whom they are enriched."

***Napoleon***

"I decided to improve the Jews: but I do not want any more of them in my Kingdom: indeed, I have done all to prove my scorn of the vilest nation in the world."

[117]

***Benjamin Franklin 1789***

Statement in the Convention, concerning Jewish Immigration:

"There is a great danger for the United States of America, this great danger is the Jew. Gentlemen, in every land which the Jews have settled, they have depressed the normal level and lowered the degree of commercial honesty. They have remained apart and unassimilated — they have created a state within a state, and when they are opposed they attempt to strangle the nation financially as in the case of Portugal and Spain. For more than 1700 years, they have lamented their sorrowful fate — namely, that they were driven out of their motherland, but gentlemen, if the civilized world today should give them back Palestine and their property, they would immediately find pressing reasons for not returning there. Why? Because they are vampires — they cannot live among themselves ; they must live among Christians and others who do not belong to their race.

"If they are not excluded from the United States by the Constitution, within less than 100 years, they will stream into this country in such numbers they will rule and destroy us and change our form of Government for which we Americans shed our blood and sacrificed life, property and personal freedom. If the Jews are not excluded, within 200 years our children will be working in the fields to feed the Jews while they remain in the Counting House gleefully rubbing their hands.

"I warn you, gentlemen, if you do not exclude the Jews forever, your children's children will curse you in your graves. Their ideas are not those of Americans even when they have lived among us for ten generations. The leopard cannot change its spots. The Jews are a danger to this land and if they are allowed to enter they will imperil our institutions — they should be excluded by the Constitution."

[As far as we know, this is a hoax — B. Franklin never uttered these words. aaargh]

[118]

Copy of leaflet designed by the Author after the Munich Agreement:

*Are you Aware that . . .*

**MR. CHAMBERLAIN  
was Burnt in Effigy  
in Moscow**

as soon as it was known that  
he had secured Peace, show-  
ing very clearly WHO  
WANTED WAR and who  
are still working ceaselessly  
to stir up strife all the world  
over ?

---

Issued by the MILITANT CHRISTIAN PATRIOTS, 93 Chancery Lane,  
W.C. 1 (HOLborn 2137), and printed by W. Whithead, 22 Lisle st,  
W.C.2

[119]

## APPENDIX 5

Reprinted from *Free Britain* June 1954

# THE OFFICIAL GAG

Lord Jowitt, either with a belated desire to do Justice to Captain Ramsay or now cautious of repeating the fabrications of the past, has admitted in his memoirs of the War Trials, published in the *London Evening Standard* of May 13th, that the defendants in the Tyler Kent affair were all along acting in good faith.

Lord Jowitt, in order to publish these memoirs at all, has been forced to make a point which neither Captain Ramsay nor Anna Wolkoff are even yet permitted to make in their own defense, the nature of the documents concerned in the case having been declared an Official Secret which they may not divulge.

Others, however, are now free to state what they have known from the beginning, namely, that Captain Ramsay was never at any time endeavouring to communicate with Germany but was trying to communicate certain information to the then Prime Minister, Mr Chamberlain, with Mr. Chamberlain was expecting and which, because of Captain Ramsay's arrest, never reached him.

Something of this information later reached Mr. Chamberlain by other channels, however, for it was disclosed in the *Forestall Diaries* that Mr.

[120]

Chamberlain had become convinced, and actually told Mr. Forestall, that powerful Jewish circles in New



York were solely responsible for maneuvering Britain into the war, unsuspected by him at the time although he was Prime Minister and ought to have been informed of what was going on.

The wedge that was driven between Mr. Chamberlain and Captain Ramsay was the lock-up and the abuse of the Official Secrets Act, followed by the elaborate dissemination of the complete fabrication by the Home Office that "the said Captain Archibald Maule Ramsay, M.P. . . had expressed his desire to co-operate with the German Government in the conquest and subsequent government of Great Britain. Later the Lord Marley added further to this fabrication by stating in the House of Lords that he had it on good authority that Captain Ramsay had agreed to become Gauliter of Scotland under a German occupation of Great Britain. He ignored the challenge of Captain Ramsay's lawyers to repeat the charge outside the House.

For fourteen years Lord Jowitt must have been well aware that Captain Ramsay was conducting an investigation in order to satisfy Mr. Chamberlain that there was documentary evidence for the facts already disclosed to him by Captain Ramsay, and that Captain Ramsay's arrest was made to prevent that documentary evidence from being presented to the Prime Minister. But it has taken all these years for Lord Jowitt to concede that Captain Ramsay is an honest man who "would never have countenanced any act which he recognized as being against the interests of his country."

C.P.



## BEWARE

The reader should avoid to download a copy of this book from <http://www.biblebelievers.org.au/> as it is severely truncated and heavily censored.

We have been using a printed (but undated) copy to which we have imposed some slight corrections. aaargh

## AAARGH

**THE WEBSITE WAS FOUNDED IN 1996 BY AN INTERNATIONAL TEAM**

<http://vho.org/aaargh>

<http://aaargh.com.mx>

We work in French, English, German, Spanish, Italian, Rumanian, Russian, Chech, Danish, Indonesian, Portuguese, Dutch, Hungarian, Arabic, Polish, Swedish, Greek, Turkish...

## THE YEARLIES OF AAARGH

<http://revurevi.net>

*Conseils de révision*

*Gaette du Golfe et des banlieues*

*The Revisionist Clarion*

*Il resto del siclo*

*El Paso del Ebro*

*Das kausale Nexusblatt*

*O revisionismo em lingua português*

*Arménichantage*

## NEW ADDITIONS ON AAARGH

<http://aaargh.com.mx/fran/nouv.html>

<http://vho.org/aaargh/fran/nouv.html>

## BOOKS (380) PUBLISHED BY AAARGH ON INTERNET

<http://vho.org/aaargh/fran/livres/livres.html>

<http://aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres/livres.html>

## DOCUMENTS, COMPILATIONS, AAARGH REPRINTS

<http://aaargh.com.mx/fran/livres/reprints.html>

<http://vho.org/aaargh/fran/livres/reprints.html>

## FREE SUBSCRIBE: (E-MAIL)

[revclar@yahoo.com.au](mailto:revclar@yahoo.com.au)

[elrevisionista@yahoo.com.ar](mailto:elrevisionista@yahoo.com.ar)

**MAIL:**

[aaarghinternational@hotmail.com](mailto:aaarghinternational@hotmail.com)

We claim to be protected by the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights; <http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>

**AAARGH, TO AVOID DYING STUPID.**

**MAKE COPIES OF THE SITE. JOIN AAARGH. BROADCAST AAARGH. WORK FOR AAARGH. LET'S TOIL FOR OUR COMMON FREEDOM. LET'S TRAMPLE THE CENSORS.**